AN

EPISTLE

TO

FRIENDS.

BRIEFLY

Commemorating the Gracious Dealings of the Lord with them; and warning them to beware of that Spirit of

Contention and Diviſion

Which hath appeared of late in

George Keith,

And ſome few others that join with him, who have made a Breach and Separation from FRIENDS in ſome Parts of *AMERICA*.

By *THOMAS ELLWOOD.*

Now I beſeech you, Brethren, mark them which cauſe Diviſions and Offences, contrary to the Doctrine which ye have learned, and avoid them, Rom. 16. 17.

London, Printed by *T. Sowle* at the Crooked-Billet in *Holly-well-lane*, *Shoreditch*, and near the Meeting-Houſe in *White-Hart-Court* in *Grace-Church-Street*. 1694.

UMI

AN EPISTLE TO FRIENDS, &c.

Dear Friends,

WHOM the Lord hath called with an holy Calling, and who, through faithfulneſs to the Heavenly Call, are become the Choſen of the Lord, it is in my Heart, in the openings of the Love of God, to ſend theſe few Lines amongſt you, as a Salutation of true and hearty Love unto you, and in the tendering ſenſe of the Lord's unſpeakable Goodneſs unto us, which at this time reſts, with an affecting weight, upon my Spirit, briefly to commemorate the gracious Dealings of the Lord with us, ſince we have been his People.

Great and manifold have been the Mercies of our God, unto us his People, in this his day; and his loving kindneſſes are beyond expreſſing. When we were young and little, his Fatherly care was over us; he preſerved us, and nouriſhed us, and cauſed us to grow up before him. How

did he carry his Lambs in his Boſom, when the Beaſts of Prey roared on every ſide ſeeking to devour! Who can rehearſe the many Deliverances he hath wrought for his People, in their paſſage from Spiritual *Egypt*! How hath he girded their Loins with ſtrength, and covered their Heads in the day of Battel! How hath he ſubdued their Enemies before them, and put to flight the Armies of Aliens! How hath he fed them with Bread from Heaven, and made them to ſuck Honey out of the Rock! Yea, he hath cauſed the Rock to give forth Water abundantly, and hath been to his People as a Brook in the way: So that, from a ſenſible Experience, we can ſay to his praiſe, Our Bread hath been ſure, and our Water hath not failed, as we have ſingly relied on him. Oh! his goodneſs is unutterable, and his faithfulneſs hath never failed them that have truſted in him. When have we ever been in Priſon for his ſake, and he hath not viſited and comforted us there? What Sufferings have any undergone on his account, and he hath not abundantly recompenſed the Loſs? Nay, hath he not often ſtopped the Mouths of Lions, and reproved Rulers for the ſake of his People, ſaying, *Touch not mine anointed, and do my prophets no harm*? In all our Exerciſes he hath been with us, and he hath ſtood by us in our ſoreſt Tryals; yea, he hath cauſed his Angel to Encamp round about us, ſo that no Weapon formed againſt us hath proſpered, but every Tongue that hath riſen up againſt us, the Lord hath given us power to condemn, bleſſed be his holy Name, and exalted and magnified be his glorious Power for ever.

Theſe

These things, and much more than I can write, I doubt not but ye, my dear Friends, are witnesses of, ye especially, my Elder Brethren, who were called early in the Morning of this day, and have stood faithful in your Testimony for God until now; who from your own both early and late Experiences can set your Seals to the Truth hereof. And unto you I do believe this brief Commemoration of the Goodness and loving Kindness of the Lord to his People will be pleasing and *delightful*, as I hope it may prove *useful* and profitable unto us all, in the stirring up of the *pure Mind*, and putting us in fresh remembrance of the Lord's manifold Favours towards us, and gracious Dealings with us; which should be as a renewed Engagement upon us to cleave fast unto the Lord, and in humility of Heart, to walk closely with him, both that we may, as far as in us lies, answer his great loving kindnesses to us-ward, and receive from him still daily strength and ability to stand, and withstand the Assaults and Temptations of the Enemy, and escape his Snares, wherewith he is, at this time, as busie and industrious to betray, and draw aside from the simplicity of the Truth, as ever he was.

For Friends, ye know we have a *restless* Adversary to watch against, and to War with; one that sometimes walks about, as a *roaring* Lion, seeking whom he may devour; and sometimes creeps about, as a *subtil* Serpent, seeking whom he may *betray*; whom, in each appearance, it is our Duty and Interest to resist, stedfast in the Faith which overcomes. I need not recou

you, my Friends, the many Winds and Floods, Storms and Tempests, of open and cruel *Persecutions*, which this roaring Adversary hath often raised, and caused to beat upon us, to have driven us (if possible) from off our Foundation; ye cannot have forgotten it, nor that noble Arm of the Lord, which was made bare for our preservation, and by preserving us against the most furious shocks, gave evidence, even to the World, that we are that People whose House is founded, and built upon the immoveable Rock, Christ Jesus. At this sort of Fighting the Enemy has been *foiled*; which has made him shift his Hand, and like a cunning Hunter *spread his Nets*, set his Snares, lay his Baits, to catch the simple and unwary ones. Thus wrought this subtil Enemy in the early Times of Christianity, sometimes stirring up the Rulers, both *Jews* and *Gentiles* to fall, with violent and bloody Hands, upon the little Flock of Christ; and sometimes in the intermissions of those Storms, covering his Hooks with the taking Baits of *Pleasure*, *Profit*, *Preferment*, catcht some, (perhaps of those that had withstood the strongest Storm of outward Persecution) and made them Instruments for himself to work by, to betray others. Such was *Diotrephes* of old, whose aspiring Mind, loving and seeking *Pre-eminence*, laboured to make a *Schism* in the Church, *prating* against even the Elders thereof with *malicious* words, *&c. John* 3. What mischief the wicked One hath wrought in our day, by such *Ambitious* Spirits, I need not recount, nor is it pleasing to me to remember, ye know it, to your grief, as well as I. But this

in

in all ſuch caſes is obſervable, that ſuch as have made *Diſturbances* in the Church, and have run into *Diviſions* and *Separations* from Friends, have framed to themſelves ſome ſpecious *pretence* or other, as the inducement to their undertaking, which they have induſtriouſly ſpread abroad, and *varniſhed* over with the faireſt Colours they could, to allure and draw others to join with them. Thus they who ſome Years ago, after long and hot Contention, went out from Friends, and ſet up, in divers parts of this Nation, *ſeparate* Meetings for themſelves, in oppoſition to the Meetings of Friends, told their deluded Followers, that Friends were departed from the *Power* of God, and were ſitting down in a *Form* without it; and that They ſtood for the *Power* againſt *Formality*: Whereas indeed, under pretence of ſtanding for the Power, they *oppoſed* the Power, and the Work thereof, rejecting that Diſcipline which the Power had brought forth, and led Friends into, as *a ſutable help* and means to keep all that profeſs Truth, in a due ſubjection to the Power. This they whoſe Eye was kept ſingle to the Lord ſaw all along: And this ſome of them who were taken with that *painted Bait*, and thereby betrayed into the Enemies Snare, ſince the Lord, in tender Mercy, hath opened again that Eye in them which the Enemy had darkned, and brought them, through Judgment, (the only right way of returning) to the true Fold again, have alſo ſeen, and with ſorrow acknowledged. And bleſſed be the Name of the Lord, his Compaſſion hath reached to many of them, and ſome he hath even plucked as Brands, out of that *Fire*

of Contention, wherein they that wilfully and obſtinately remain *without Repentance*, will aſſuredly be *conſumed*. O that all would take warning in time!

But, alas! my Friends, ſo great is the *Malice* and *Craft* of the Evil One, who always envies the Proſperity and Peace of *Sion*, that ſeeing his former Deſign againſt the Diſcipline of the Church diſcovered, and defeated, and the beſt of them whom he had drawn thereinto, and engaged therein, recovered from him, he hath formed a *new deſign*, to raiſe *another* Diviſion, and make a *freſh* Breach amongſt the People of God. Which although begun in another part of the World, *AMERICA*; yet in as much as *George Keith*, who is the *Principal Agent* in it, hath ſometime ago written ſeveral Books, and Papers, which being Printed have been ſent over, and ſpread through this Nation, and other parts of *Europe*, to give the World an Account thereof; and is alſo ſince come over himſelf, to maintain and carry on the Work he hath begun: I find my Spirit the more engaged to warn all Friends every where to be watchful, and wary how they lend an Ear to that Spirit (whatever the Inſtruments may *have been*, in which it now works) that would *ſow Diſſention* amongſt Brethren, and labours to make Diviſions, Rents and Breaches in the Church of Chriſt. Ah Friends, this is the work of the *old* Enemy, the *Troubler* of *Iſrael*, the *Diſturber* of the Churches Peace in all Ages. And although he hath now entred into, and appears and works in and by *other* Inſtruments and Agents, and hath ſet up *another* pretence for his work; yet

yet it is the *ſame* Spirit which hath given ſo great Trouble and Diſturbance to the Church of God, in this Nation, for divers Years paſt, and the *old Separatiſt*'s Flock to it, and after it. They have been great Promoters and Spreaders of *G. K*'s Books, even before he himſelf came over. One of the Chief of them, in the County of *Bucks*, hath taken no ſmall pains, nor ſpared charge, to fill the Country with them; ſo *acceptable* is the work of Contention and Diviſion to them. And indeed, this *Diſh* of *Diſcord* of *G. K*'s Dreſſing, hath made a *Feaſt* for them, as well as for the moſt envious Profeſſors, and the Prophane. Yet (as I hinted before) the pretence for this is quite different from that, which they ſet up for their *Separation*. Theirs related to *Diſcipline*, This to *Doctrine*: They alledged that Friends were gone too much from the *Inward* to the *Outward*; This that Friends were gone too much from the *Outward* to the *Inward*. For *G. K*'s complaint and charge is, That Friends do not Preach the outward Appearance and Manifeſtation of Chriſt in the Fleſh enough, or oft enough. And ſo *vain* he is to think, and ſay, That God hath raiſed him up for that ſervice. But, my dear Friends, as ye well know this Charge of his to be *falſe*, and that the Teſtimony of Truth hath always been acknowledged and born by Friends from the beginning, as occaſion has offered, to the *Outward* Manifeſtation and Appearance of Chriſt, as well as to the *Inward*: So we may well and reaſonably conclude, that if God had raiſed him up for, or imployed him in any ſuch ſervice as he pretends to, he would have been Endued with

with *Patience* and Chriſtian *Meekneſs* ſutable for ſuch a work, and not have run on in ſuch an impetuous *height of Mind*, as he has done, to *break the ſacred Bond of Union*, disjoint himſelf from Friends by open Separation, and publiſh to the World whatſoever he thought might tend to the defamation of thoſe Friends, againſt whom he had taken offence, thereby giving occaſion to the Adverſaries of Truth to deſpiſe it, and reproach its Followers. But alas, alas! it is too evident that he hath ſet himſelf, in an *exalted* Spirit of *Pride* and *Self-conceit*, above and againſt not only the Friends in *America*, but the Body of Friends in this Nation. For at the Yearly Meeting, lately holden in *London*, where moſt of the *Ancient* Miniſtring Friends were preſent, and many other *weighty* Friends from the ſeveral Counties of *England* (who were choſen by the Friends of their reſpective Counties to attend the ſervice of that Meeting) the differences in *America* being taken into conſideration, and ſeveral Days ſpent about them; after a *full hearing* of what *G. K.* had to offer in his own defence, the ſenſe and advice of that Meeting was (particularly with reſpect to the *Separation* in *America*, and to *G. K.*'s printed Books, about the differences) that *the Separation lay at his Door*, and that he ought ſincerely to uſe his utmoſt Endeavours and Intereſt with his Friends concerned, to remove it, *&c.* And that the *expoſing* the differences in *Print* to the World, to the view of our Enemies, both in *America* and *Europe*, hath been of *great diſſervice* to the Truth, and given great occaſion of *Offence* and *Stumbling* to many, and of great *Sorrow* and *Grief* to us,

and

and many Faithful Friends, *opening the Mouths o our Adverſaries*, Profeſſors and others, to *reproach* the Truth and Friends thereof: And it wao the clear and general ſenſe of that Meeting, that *G. K.* and the reſt concerned with him, were *not acted in God's Wiſdom and Counſel therein, &c.* And therefore it was the tender Advice and Counſel of that Meeting, that *G. K.* ſhould either *Call* in his Books, or at leaſt publiſh ſomething innocently, and effectually to *clear* the *Body* of the People called Quakers, and their Miniſters, from thoſe groſs Errors charged on ſome few in *America*; and *retract* the *bitter Language* in them, *&c.*

How frowardly he received this *Soft* and eaſy Judgment, delivered in the moſt *gentle* terms, ſuch of you, my Friends, as were then preſent, will not, I ſuppoſe, ſoon forget. How far he hath ſince been from following the advice therein given him, Nay how greatly he, and his companions have abuſed both it, and the Yearly Meeting from which it came, their late works manifeſt. For ſoon after that Meeting was over, a Copy of the Proceedings thereof (which was delivered to him in Manuſcript) was Printed, with a moſt *Scandalous* Preface before it, and certain Queries behind it, both ſubſcribed by one *Robert Hannay* (who came out of *America* with him. How far *G. K.* had an hand, or was *concerned*, in the writing of that Book, I will not here ſay. But I may ſay the matter of the Queries in that Book, is ſo much the ſame with the matter of the other Book, publiſhed ſoon after with *G. K*'s name to it, and the ſtile thereof ſo agreeable to his ſtile, in that and

his

his other writings, that whoever ſhall take him for the Author of it, will, I think, be very *excuſable*, though he ſhould prove in part miſtaken. But be it as it will; I will not inſiſt on what I have heard, of *G. K*'s. laying the manſcript on his Cupboard, and anothers taking it thence, while his back was turned (which looks but like a *Cupboard-Shift*:) But in as much as they are *both of a Party*, and *R. Hannay* is at *G. K*'s. right hand in his work of contention and diviſion, and *G. K.* (though often put upon it) hath not publickly diſowned that Pamphlet which *R. Hannay*'s name is to, I do not think I ſhall wrong *G.K.* (as indeed I would not) in ſuppoſing him to have at leaſt a ſhare therein; and in applying it accordingly. The Preface to that Pamphlet tells the Reader, *In the following Account, thou maiſt find a Party of them, of the Yearly Meeting at* London, *are proved guilty of endeavouring to cloak, and cover the Antichriſtian Errors, and perſecuting Practiſes of their Appoſtate Brethren in* Penſilvania, *&c. And the Proceedings of the Yearly Meeting* are there called *partial*, and *their Judgment falſe*; which is alſo repeated, in very *unſeemly* terms, in the Queries. By this Friends, ye may clearly ſee, that it is not only ſome few Friends, in *America*, that *G. K.* and and his Abettors Strike at, but *the Body of Friends here*; and that, as they have made a Diviſion and Breach amongſt Friends there, ſo they deſign and endeavour to do the like here, repreſenting the Yearly Meeting, to the World, as divided, and calling the ſence and advice thereof, *the Judgment of a Party, or Faction, of the Yearly Meeting*, which in their Queries is often repeated. I need

not

not ſpend time to *refute* this *Falſhood*, there being ſo many Witneſſes preſent at that Meeting, who can teſtifie the *good Agreement* thereof, and *G. K.* himſelf knows that when the ſenſe and Advice of the Meeting was, in the Meeting openly Read and delivered in writing to him, there was not any one Member of the Meeting that *Objected* againſt it, or expreſſed any diſſent from it; but on the contrary, ſome who had ſhewed the moſt of tenderneſs towards him, did declare their Satisfaction therein, and warned him *not to kick againſt it*, (as he hath done) but to *Receive it as the Councel of God to him.* But Friends, that which is chiefly in my mind at this time, with relation to this matter, is, to manifeſt unto you the *falſneſs* of that Spirit, by which theſe men are led and acted, and that the *deſign* thereof is to *break*, *divide* and *ſcatter* the Flock of God, and render us a Reproach and Deriſion to the World; that ye being ſenſible thereof, and ſeeing the *Inſincerity* of theſe men in their work, may be armed againſt their *Miſchievous* Attempts, and preſerved out of the Snares, which the Wicked one hath made, and is ſtill making uſe of them to lay.

Quickly after the Publication of the fore-mentioned Paper, ſigned by *R. Hannay*, another Book came forth in Print, with *George Keith*'s name to it, called the *cauſeleſs Ground of ſurmiſes* &c. *removed.* In the introduction to which (next after the Title) he hath theſe words, *viz. I tenderly intreat and deſire that none apply or conſtrue any words containing in theſe following lines, as intended by me in way of Reflection, Blame or Charge, againſt either the Body of Friends in general, or any particular*

Meeting,

Meeting, or Meetings of Friends in particular, or against any ſingular, faithful Friend or Friends whatſoever, &c. Though this relates more immediately to that Book which *G, K*'s name is to, yet compare this with what I recited before out of the other Book, publiſhed under *Hannay*'s name, and how plainly doth it ſhew *double-dealing*, and want of Sincerity in him, or them, that wrote them! Under his Friend *Hannay*'s name we are told, *the Judgment given by the Yearly Meeting at* London, *was the Judgment of a Party or Faction*; that *their Proceedings were Partial, and their Judgment Falſe*; that *they are therein proved guilty of endeavouring to cloak and cover the Antichriſtian Errors, and perſecuting Practiſes of their Apoſtate Brethren in* Penſilvania, &c. In his other Book (which his one name is to) *he tenderly intreats and deſires that none may apply, or conſtrue any words contained therein, as intended by him in way of Reflection, Blame or Charge, againſt either the Body of Friends in general, or any praticular Meeting, or Meetings of Friends in particular, or againſt any ſingular, faithful Friend or Friends whatſoever*. Was it then no Reflection, Blame or Charge, againſt either the Body of Friends in general, or any particular Meeting, to charge the Yearly Meeting at *London*, in that falſe, foul and baſe manner, as is before recited out of that Book, which was publiſhed with *Hannay*'s name to it! What greater Charge, what fouler Reflection, can be made againſt a Body of People in general, or a particular Meeting, than is contained in that *ſcurrilous Pamphlet* againſt the Yearly Meeting! It is not unlikely that he will here endeavour to acquit himſelf from the imputation

tation of Insincerity, by casting that Pamphlet upon his Friend *Hannay*, (whose name is to it) and alledging that the Caution given in the other Book (to which his own name is set) is restrained to what is contained in that Book. But considering the manner of that Pamphlets, coming forth, the *matter* and *Stile* thereof, and his refusing to to disown it, I shall leave it (my Friends) to to your inpartial Judgment, whether the *Reflections* contained in that Pamphlet against the Yearly Meeting are not justly to be charged upon him; and if so, whether it could stand with sincerity and and plain dealing, to *inveigh so bitterly* against the Yearly Meeting in the one, and immediatly after, to desire so demurely that none would apply, or construe any words contained in the other, as intended by him in way of Reflection, *&c.*

But to manifest his *insincerity* more directly and fully, I shall offer you some Passages out of that Book it self, to which he hath set his name, in which I Question whether there be many free from *Reflection* against the Yearly Meeting. In p. 4. and 5. he says, *It was therfore a great surprisal to us, to find some so to misconstrue our real and sincere intention, and so greatly to misunderstand us, as to charge it upon us, that our late Printed Book, have tended to give great occasion of offence, and stumbling to many,* &c. *Opening the mouths of our Adversaries, Professors and others, to reproach the Truth and Friends thereof.* (These latter words are taken out of that Paper, which the Yearly Meeting drew up, and delivered to *G. K.* as their sense and advice in that matter; so that in this he must refer to the Yearly Meeting.) Then within four or five lines after,

he

he adds, *Is it not more apparent that to pass by in silence, without any censure or publick Testimony, gross and vile Errors, ——doth bring Reproach upon Truth and Friends thereof, and doth open the Mouth of Adversaries to reproach us, as being guilty of cloaking such gross Errors amongst us.* That this Charge of passing by in silence, without any censure or publick Testimony, gross and vile Errors, and cloaking them (as his common phrase is) is intended by *George Keith* against the Yearly Meeting, is plain by what he says in p. 14. where speaking of the Yearly Meeting, he says, *In order to make up the Breach in* America, *and to prevent any hurt here, THEY ought to pass an Express, Censure, and Judgment upon all and every one of these gross and vile Errors, that I have proved divers of them guilty of in* Pensilvania, *&c.* Now is not this a *Reflection*, and a very foul one too, upon the Yearly Meeting, to insinuate that they pass by in silence, *cover'd and cloak'd*, gross and vile Errors, without any Censure or publick Testimony? And is it not then great *Hypocrisie* in *G. K.* to say in his Introduction to the same Book, *I tenderly intreat and desire, that none apply, or construe any words contained in these following Lines, as intended by me in way of Reflection, Blame or Charge, against either the Body of Friends in general, or any particular Meeting, or Meetings of Friends in particular*, &c?

Again, in p. 6. he says, *It had been but reasonable and convenient for such as have so positively blamed me, and them concerned with me, both for the Printing and Separation, to have answered our Reasons*, &c. *and also to have given us plain Reasons and Proof from Scripture whereby to convince us of sin,*

and

and that we were not acted in God's Wiſdom and Counſel therein (the very words in the Yearly Meeting's Paper to him.) And a few Lines after, *They muſt convince us by ſtronger and better Arguments, than to ſay, It is their clear and general ſenſe,* (which are the expreſs words of the Yearly Meeting Paper to him alſo.) And going on, in p. 7. with the ſame matter, he compares the Meetings, ſaying, *That he, and the reſt therein concerned with him, were not acted in God's Wiſdom and Counſel, in their Printing and Separating, to the Papiſts, ſaying the like of the Proteſtants,* viz. *That their Printing againſt, and Separating from the Church of* Rome, *and one another, is not of God, nor is acted in the Wiſdom and Counſel of God.* Is not this *Reflection*, Blame, and *Charge* in every part of it? And is it not then great Deceit in *G. K.* ſo *ſmoothly* to beſpeak his Reader in the entrance into the ſame Book, in theſe words, *I tenderly intreat and deſire that none apply, or conſtrue any Words contained in theſe following Lines, as intended by me in way of Reflection, Blame or Charge, againſt either the Body of Friends in general, or any particular Meeting, or Meetings of Friends in particular,* &c.

Again, in p. 10. he ſays, *And as concerning the Advice given me by ſome to retract the bitter or ſevere Language that I have given to ſome of my Oppoſers, in ſome of the late Printed Books, which Advice they gave with telling me, and many others, that I have confeſſed my humane Imperfections and Paſſions:* (This relates to the Yearly Meeting's Paper of Advice, given to him.) *To this* (ſays he) *I anſwer, ſome who have ſo adviſed me, ſhould give me*

their good Example, by retracting their much more bitter Language, and more hard and severe Names they have given to some who have differed from them in less matters. And p. 11: *As to my confessing my humane Imperfections, it is not well so to glory over me,* &c. *while they are silent wholly of some of their own far greater Imperfections and Passionate Behaviour used towards me.* And again, *I judge it more Christian, and a greater Argument of a Man's growth towards Perfection, to acknowledge his sinful Infirmities in the sight of God or Men, and to be humbled under the sense of them, than like the proud Pharisee to justifie ones self, when he may be, and is really guilty of greater Evils.* Is not here *Reflection* upon *Reflection*, and *Charge* upon *Charge*? Judge then, my Friends, what Conscience this Man must have, who in the same Book could say, *I tenderly intreat and desire that none apply, or construe any words contained in these following Lines, as intended by me in way of Reflection, Blame, or Charge against either the Body of Friends in general, or any particular Meeting, or Meetings of Friends in particular, or against any singular, faithful Friend or Friends whatsoever.*

I think the Instances I have produced out of his own Book (that I mean which has his Name to it, for I take the *other* to be his too, though *Hannay*'s Name be to it) are sufficient to prove the points for which I brought them, namely, that *G. Keith* hath not only *run into Opposition* to the Friends in *America*, but also runs against and *opposes the Body of Friends here*, rejects and slights the sense and advice of the late Yearly Meeting at *London*, (which I hope I may with as good ground say, was the only

only Representative of the Church here at that time, as he doth, p. 5. That the Monthly Meeting at *Philadelphia*, in the 12 Month 91. (though denied by the Quarterly Meeting there to be an orderly and rightly constituted Meeting at all) was the only Representative of the Church in that place at that time.) And that he is *deeply guilty of Insincerity and Double-dealing*.

Now that it may also appear, that he is the *principal* Person that hath begun, and carried on the work of *Contention* and *Division* in *America*, and that the sence of the Yearly Meeting, with respect both to his late printed Books, and to the *Separation*, is just, and rightly grounded, I shall offer to your consideration such Observations, relating thereunto, as I have made out of his own, and his Parties Books. First, I observe that one Cause or Occasion, which *G. K.* assigns for the Difference between him, and Friends in *America*, is, that one *W. Stockdale* having taken some Exception at his manner of Preaching, and he complaining thereof to a Yearly Meeting of Ministring Friends in *Philadelphia*, they were not so *expeditious* in giving their Judgment therein, as he expected. For he says (in his Book called, *The Plea of the Innocent*, &c. p. 3.) *no less than six several Meetings were had about this matter, in that time of the Yearly Meeting*. For which delay (though occasioned by his own unruliness, in *refusing to withdraw*, at the Meetings desire, that the Meeting might consider of his

Charge and Proof; which refusal of his to go forth, himself acknowledges, and attempts to vindicate, in his Book called, *Some Reasons and Causes of the late Separation*, p. 14.) he upbraids the Meeting most shamefully thus, *Is it not matter of astonishment, that such an easie Question being proposed to so many Men called Ministers of Christ, all highly pretending to the Spirit's immediate Teachings and Leadings, and to be in a degree of Christianity above all other Professions in* Christendom *(there being assembled of these called Ministers out of these three Provinces, about Forty, or Fifty, if not more) six Meetings could not determine it,* viz. *Whether to preach Faith in Christ within us, and Faith in Christ without us, was to preach two Christs, or one?* What could any open *Opposer*, or the greatest *Despiser* of the Spirit's Teachings, have reflected more *scornfully!* So again he says, *It will be matter of admiration to all impartial Persons that hear it, who have the least true knowledge in the Mystery of Christ, this great and solemn Assembly of so many high Pretenders to be Ministers of Christ, were at a great stand and demur to determine, and in the conclusion of the sixth Meeting gave but a very slender and partial determination and judgment concerning it.* A determination it seems then (by his own acknowledgment) was given in the sixth of those Meetings; though he said before, Six Meetings could not determine it, which had another said, he would have been ready to have called it a *Contradiction.* And if, as he says, the Determination was *partial*, surely

ly it lean'd to *his part*; for it was given againſt *W. Stockdale*, and in favour of him; as appears by that little of it which he recites in his ſaid Book called, *The Plea, &c.* p. 22. where he ſays, *They give their Judgment, that* W. S. *is reprovable and blame-worthy for uttering the ſaid Words*, viz. That *G. K*'s preaching Chriſt within and Chriſt without, was preaching two Chriſts) *they being an offence to many ſound and tender Friends, and that he condemn the ſame.* And in his other Book called, *Reaſons of the Separation*, p. 11. ſome other parts of that Meetings Judgment, in that caſe, being recited, it is ſaid, they did deliver it as their Senſe and Judgment, *That the ſaid* W—— *had abuſed* G. K. *thereby, and that* G. K's *Doctrine was right and true in preaching Faith in Chriſt within, and Faith in Chriſt without.* Much to the ſame purpoſe he repeats in p. 14. of the ſame Book, ſaying, *At the laſt of ſix Meetings it was declared, That* G. K's *Doctrine concerning Chriſt within and Chriſt without to be one Lord Jeſus Chriſt, was true, and that therefore* W—— *was blame-worthy.* So that by theſe pieces of that Judgment, which I have gathered out of thoſe two Books of his, it appears that that Yearly Meeting did *receive G. K*'s Complaint againſt *W. Stockdale*, did *hear* and examine the matter, and in the *ſame* Meeting did proceed to *give Judgment* againſt *W. Stockdale*, as having abuſed *G. K.* and did order him to condemn the ſame. And they reſted not there; but to remove all occaſion of doubt or offence

from *G. K*'s Mind, they did, it ſeems, at the ſame time juſtifie and aſſert the Doctrine which *G. K.* had preached, declaring the Doctrine, That Chriſt within and Chriſt without is one Lord Jeſus Chriſt to be true and right Doctrine. By which alſo it doth appear, that that Meeting of Miniſtring Friends were not (as *G. K.* abuſively repreſents them) at a ſtand and demure to determine whether the Doctrine was true or falſe: But if they were at a ſtand at all, it was to determine whether the Charge exhibited by *G. K.* againſt *W. S.* was true or falſe; *W. S.* then (and to his dying day) denying that he ſpake thoſe words, which *G. K.* charged him with. Now Friends, what ground *G. K.* could have from hence to *Unchriſtian* that Meeting, write and print againſt thoſe Friends, as *Heathens*, and charge them with *covering and cloaking groſs and vile Errors, tolerating damnable Hereſies and Doctrines of Devils*, as he has done, I leave to you to conſider; and how little regard he hath therein had to the Honour of God, and the Peace of the Church.

Nor had he more reaſon to run againſt and revile (as he has done) the Monthly Meeting at *Philadelphia*, for not condemning *T. Fitzwater*, for charging him with denying the ſufficiency of the Light without ſomething elſe (which he aſſigns for another Cauſe of his Quarrel) ſince it appears by the Act (as he calls it) of that Monthly Meeting (as he has printed it in his Book called, *The Plea of the Inno-*

Innocent, p. 10.) *That four credible Evidences gave Teſtimony, that they heard him* (G. K.) *ſay, He did not believe the Light was ſufficient, without ſomething elſe.* So that it ſeems, *T. F.* ſufficiently proved the words he charged *G. K.* with ſpeaking, and *G. K*'s explaining *afterwards*, what he mean'd by that ſomething elſe, could be no juſt ground for that Meeting to have condemned *T. F.* as if he had falſly accuſed *G. K.* of ſpeaking words he had not ſpoken.

Then as to the *Separation* in *America*, which he would fain caſt off from himſelf, I ſhall alſo ſhew, from his own Books and Papers, that *He*, and *They* that are joined with him, are in it, and began it. In his late printed Book called. *The Cauſleſs Ground of Surmiſes, &c. removed*, p. 6. he ſays, *For the firſt ſeparate Meeting at* Philadelphia, *we began it not, but they of the other ſide, as I have made to appear before many Witneſſes.* If in this he refers to what he ſaid, on that ſubject, in our Yearly Meeting at *London*, I deny it, and affirm, that the contrary was made appear in and to that Meeting; for which I refer to the Friends then preſent. I remember indeed, he alledged in that Meeting, that at a Monthly Meeting in *Philadelphia*, T. Lloyd *went away, and took away a Skirt, or Wing* (as he called it) *of the meeting with him; and that that meeting afterwards adjourning it ſelf to another time and place, was denied by the Quarterly Meeting to be a right Monthly Meeting*; and this we would have taken for

for the beginning of the Separation. But this was eaſily refuted from his own Book called, *Some Reaſons, &c. of the Separation*, in p. 8. of which, he aſſigns this for the *firſt Cauſe* of the Separation. And he was then told, that if this Act of *T. L*'s was the Cauſe of the Separation, then it could not be the Separation it ſelf: But the Separation muſt come after this, as the Effect follows the Cauſe. Nay in p. 15. of the ſame Book, he aſſigns *another* Act, which fell out ſome time after this (and of which more anon) as a *ſecond* Cauſe of the Separation; which plainly ſhews *the Separation was not then begun*, and conſequently that Act of *T. Lloyd*'s going from the Monthly Meeting (ſuppoſing it true in fact) was not an Act of Separation, and therefore the Separation not begun by that. And indeed, whoever ſhall conſiderately read the Account *G. K.* himſelf hath given of that Monthly Meeting at *Philadelphia*, in his Book before-cited, may eaſily ſee that this Allegation of *T. L*'s going away, and drawing off a Skirt or Wing of the Meeting, is but *a late invented pretence*, ſince that other Book called, *Some Reaſons and Cauſes of the late Separation*, was written. For in that, though he gives a particular Account of that Meeting, yet he mentions nothing of *T. L*'s going off and drawing a Skirt of the Meeting with him. But, having mentioned a Controverſial Debate that was in that Meeting between *T. Fitzwater* and himſelf, he ſays, *After much diſcourſe about theſe matters, the Meeting did adjourn with unanimous*

unanimous consent of them that staid, which (he says) *was the far greatest part, and these who went away before the adjourning of it said nothing against it, nor was the Meeting understood to be broken up before the Adjournment, only some few did go away, it being cold weather, and growing dark.* What appearance is here of any *breach* made by them that went away, or that they went away in disunion, or discontent? But rather that the *weather* being *cold*, and the Meeting having sat till *Night came on*, did rise and break up *in course*; and that after some were gone away, others that remained *took upon them* to adjourn the Meeting to another time and place. And if so, it is no wonder, that they who were gone before the adjourning of it, said nothing against it: For how should they say any thing against that they knew not! But it is observable, *G. K.* doth not say, the Meeting was *not* broke up before the Adjournment; but that it was not understood to be broke up before the Adjournment. But surely, if *T. L.* had gone away *in the Meeting time*, and had drawn off a Skirt or Wing (as he calls it) of the Meeting; and this had been done in an *abrupt disorderly* manner, and in way of *Breach*, it may well be supposed that the rest that remained at the Monthly Meeting, and as such adjourned themselves to another time and place, would have taken notice of this as a *great disorder*, and have *called them to an Account for it*, which yet we find no *mention of* in the Account he gives of their adjourned

Meet-

Meeting, though he particularizes the ſeveral Judgments given in it. But on the contrary, at the next Quarterly Meeting, the Friends diſowned the Acts of that adjourned Meeting, on that very ſcore, of its being *unduly appointed* after the Monthly Meeting was ended and riſen. And as that adjourned Meeting's not calling thoſe Friends to an Account, who he ſays went off from the Monthly Meeting, is an Argument that they went not off in a diſorderly manner, before the Meeting was ended; eſpecially ſince it appears by him, that the Clark of the Meeting was one of them that was gone before the Adjournment, and took the Meeting's Book with him: So the departure of the Clark, with the Book, *unblamed*, is an evidence that *the Meeting* was ended before they went, and conſequently that *the Adjournment was irregular*, and without Authority. From all which Premiſes the Concluſion will be, that that which *G. K.* calls *T. Lloyd*'s departing, and taking with him a Skirt or Wing of the Meeting was *no Act of Separation*, nor had any tendency thereunto. Beſides, it is not ſo much as alledged by *G. K.* that *T. L.* and they that went with him, went to any other *place* to meet *apart* from them: And certain it is he and thoſe other Friends continued to keep their Monthly Meeting afterwards in its former regular courſe. And if at the Quarterly Meeting the Friends refuſed to own or recognize the Acts of that adjourned Meeting, as *G. K.* complains; yet as their ſo refuſing was

no

no Act of Separation in thoſe Friends, ſo neither was it a juſt ground or provocation to the others to ſeparate: For the not owning the Acts of that Adjourned Meeting was not a diſowning of them to be Friends, though it was a diſowning of them to be a rightly Conſtituted and Authorized Monthly Meeting; which they might not be, and yet might have a place among Friends. And therefore *G. K*'s way of Reaſoning here is not Reaſonable, nor will hold: For he ſays, (p. 9. of ſome Reaſons of the Separation) *there is no equity or reaſon why they having denied us to be a Meeting, that we ſhould own them*, &c. I ſay yes, there is equity and reaſon why theſe ſhould own them to be Friends, notwithſtanding their denying theſe to be a Meeting, ſeeing they did not deny theſe to be Friends: For the queſtion then, and upon that Act, was not whether theſe were *Friends*, or no; but whether theſe were *a rightly conſtituted Monthly Meeting*, or no. His ſaying *we were really a Meeting, lawfully Adjourned*, neither makes, nor proves them ſo. And truly the time, manner and circumſtances, of that Adjournment conſidered; it ſeems to me that this was an Irregular Meeting, Surreptitiouſly obtained, to ſerve a private end, and the rather for that I obſerve, when he ſets forth (to grace it) the Number of them that met upon that Adjournment, conſiſting of (he ſays) *at leaſt Sixty Perſons*, he adds (which as much diſgraces it) *moſt of which uſed to keep monthly Meetings*. So that Nine and twenty of

those Sixty might be raw or loose Persons, brought in to do a job, or serve a turn: And that they were so, I am the more induced to think, from his giving the Names of *some* of them, but not of them *all*, *Reason* of *Separation* p. 19.

A *Second* Cause which *G. K.* assigns for the Separation (hinted before) and by which he would cast it off from himself upon Friends, is the removing of a Meeting from one place to another without his, and some others Consent. Of this he complains in p. 15. of the Reasons and Causes of the Separation thus, *That whereas in the* Monthly *Meeting in the first* Month *last* (but no Year set, either when that was, or when his Book was Printed, as there is scarce to any of his late Printed things, which renders him and his work more *Obscure*) *a Proposition being made to change the* Meetings, *both at the Centre and in the Town, and some being for the said Change, and others against it, and having good reasons why they were against the said Change, yet a Party in the* Meeting, *contrary to our declared mind and assent, assumed a power over them that dissented, to change the said* Meetings; *a thing we have not known formerly allowed by Friends any where in their monthly Meetings, that one Party (suppose equal or greater in Number than the rest) should assume a power to appoint or change places and times of* Meetings, *without the consent of their Brethren. For things of that Nature especially, use always to be done with unanimous consent, and not by plurality of votes, which is not*

the

the way of Truth; And because we were not free to ſtand to the arbitrary and raſh Determination, as to that change, therefore we met at the ordinary Meeting place, as formerly practiſed, and they began the Separation, in keeping a publick Meeting in the After-Noon at the Bank, contrary to our declared ſence and mind, only ſome of us, met at a private Family Meeting in the Evening, at the Houſe of G. K. *that could be counted no Separate Meeting for that day.*

Inſtating this matter, *G. K.* hath uſed a Fallacy which by ſome is called, *A concealing of the Truth*, which he hath done to that Degree, that I do not think the moſt *peircing* Apprehention can make a right Judgment upon it, without further information. Therefore, Friends, that ye may have *a Right underſtanding* of the matter, I ſhall give you as plain an Account thereof as I can, according as I obſerved it was opened to us in the Yearly Meeting, and as I collect it from his own Books. The Friends at *Philadelphia* have two Meeting-Houſes, one at a place called the *Bank* or *Front*; the other, about a Mile from that, at a place called the *Centre*. In the Summer time, the Days being long and the ways and Weather good, they uſed to meet at each of theſe places ever Firſt-Day of the Week, *viz.* At the *Centre* in the Fore-noon, and at the *Bank* in the After-noon. But in the Winter, when Days were ſhort, and the ways and Weather foul and bad, they uſed to with-draw the Meeting from the *Centre* to the *Bank*; and ſo met not at all at the

the *Centre* in the Winter time, but at the *Bank* only: And of this Change of place, they uſed to give publick Notice both Spring and Fall. This, which was the moſt Material part of the Account, he has concealed (for what reaſon ye may gueſs) and ſays, *a Propoſition was made to change the Meetings*; as if it had been a *New* Propoſition, never known or heard of before, when as indeed it was but a publiſhing, or giving notice of the removal of the Meeting from one Houſe to the other, according to the ordinary and uſual courſe, and that by a former ſettled *Agreement*, which had been held and obſerved for divers years, before there was any breach, or publick difference among them. And ye may obſerve he ſays, the Propoſition (as he calls it) for changing the Meetings was made in the *Firſt* Month; a ſuitable time for the Meeting to return to the Centre again, the Winter being over. Now upon this *publication* of the Meetings return to the Centre, (where it uſed to be kept in the Forenoon during the Summer Seaſon) he, I perceive, and ſome others were againſt it, and had good Reaſons (he ſays) why they were againſt it. But as he has not given us thoſe Reaſons, that we might judge of their goodneſs: So the proceeding ſhews they were not good enough to prevail with the Monthly Meeting, to alter the *ſettled Courſe* of returning to meet at the Centre in the Summer, but they did remove the Meeting thither, and held it there in the Forenoons, while the Summer laſted, and at the approach of Winter, came back to the

Bank

Bank again, *as they uſed to do* in other Years, both before and ſince. So that here was not only *no Separation* made by the Friends in this removing of the Meeting, but not ſo much as any *alteration* or *change* from their *uſual* courſe and method. I remember indeed (which I would here note) *G. K.* did object, That *the Meeting was removed that Year ſomewhat earlier, than it had been ſome other Years.* But to that it was replied, by the Friends of *Penſilvania* then preſent, that there was no *certain* day prefixt and ſettled for the removing thereof; but it was either earlier or later in the Year, according as the Seaſons of the Year proved, fair or foul for weather. *G. K*'s ſaying, therefore, that They (meaning the Friends there whom he oppoſes) began the Separation in keeping a publick Meeting in the Afternoon at the Bank, has neither truth nor force in it; ſince it is evident they uſed to keep a publick Meeting in the Afternoon, during the Summer time, in other Years both before and after. Yet it plainly contradicts and overturns what he alledged before, in that which he aſſigned as the *firſt* Cauſe of Separation, namely, *T. Lloyd*'s going out of the Monthly Meeting, and taking a Skirt or Wing of the Meeting away with him; and the Quarterly Meeting's refuſing to Record the Acts of the Adjourned Meeting, or to own that for a right Monthly Meeting: For if (as he would have his Reader believe) that was the *firſt* cauſe of the Separation, and the Breach and Separation was

then

then and *thereby* begun, then the removing of the Meeting *afterwards* could not be the *beginning* of it: And if the Friends that removed the Meeting, did *thereby begin* the Separation, then what was done *before that time*, at the Monthly and Quarterly Meetings, could not be the beginning of it. So that in this *G. K.* plainly *interferes*. But when he ſays that (upon the Meetings being removed) *We* (meaning himſelf and his Party) *met at the ordinary Meeting-place, as formerly practiſed*, he foully *prevaricates*; for he knows that was not the ordinary Meeting-place *for thoſe Times and Seaſons* wherein he and his met in it; and that it was not the former practice to meet there *at thoſe Times and Seaſons*. But the ordinary Meeting-place for thoſe Times and Seaſons was that to which the Meeting was then removed, *according to former practice*. And whereas he charges a Party in the Meeting (where he ſays, the Propoſition was made for changing the Meetings) with *aſſuming a power over them that diſſented, to change the ſaid Meeting*, and complains of it as *a thing we have not known formerly allowed by Friends any where in their Monthly Meetings, that one Party ſhould aſſume a power to appoint or change Places and Times of Meetings without the Conſent of their Brethren*; in this he has drawn up his own Charge, and the Complaint turns upon himſelf. For that Meeting, which was removed, being, by *former*, both Agreement and Practice, to be removed from that place to the other, *he* and his

Party

Party, in oppoſing that removal, *aſſumed a Power* over the Friends of the Meeting, to appoint *that* Place for the Meeting, without and againſt the conſent of the Brethren, whereas the *other* was its right and proper place for that time. And therefore *he*, and they that were with him, continuing to meet there, when the Meeting in courſe was not, nor ſhould be there, and doing this in Oppoſition to the Friends of the Meeting, *he* and they that join'd with him therein, *made and began the Separation.* And indeed, in this he is the more to be blamed, that he ſhould urge the removing of that Meeting as an inſtance, or proof, that the Friends began the Separation, when as he himſelf declared ſoon after to *Tho. Wilſon* in *Penſylvania*, (asking him what End he thought the Friends had in removing that Meeting) that *he believed they did it to force him to meet with them* (as *Tho. Wilſon* teſtified to his Face in the Yearly Meeting at *London*) by which it is evident, that *G. K.* himſelf was ſenſible the Friends had no intention or deſire either to ſeparate from him, or to have him ſeparate from them. And this further ſhews his Inſincerity. He makes a very *lame Excuſe* for their meeting at a private Family-meeting in the Evening at his Houſe, which, he ſays, *could be counted no ſeparate Meeting for that day.* But as he gives no account by *whoſe Appointment*, or *what Authority* that Meeting was held; ſo he offers no reaſon why it could not be counted a ſeparate Meeting. He is no more plain in what follows. He ſays, *Afterwards, We finding they were reſolved to continue in their way of Separation, and that ſome had*

endeavoured to Lock us out from meeting at the Bank in the Forenoon, this put us upon ſeeking a new place to meet in, in caſe we had been diſappointed of the other. But how did they find the Friends were reſolved to coutinue in their way of Separation (as he calls it?) If they would have found that, they ſhould have ſtaid till the Seaſon of the Year had come for the Meeting to return in courſe to the Bank again, and if the Friends had not then return'd, he might have had ſome pretence for his Suggeſtion: But he well knows *they did return* in their ordinary Courſe, and at the uſual Seaſon of the Year; and that he and his Party, who had kept up a *ſeparate* Meeting there in their abſence, did, before the Friends return'd, provide themſelves another Houſe to meet in, an abſolute ſeparate Meeting-place, (uſually called *The Barbadoes-Houſe*) wherein he cannot pretend any Meeting of Friends was ever held before. It is a *Sham* therefore he puts upon his Reader (and it is a *ſhame* for him to do it) in ſaying, They ſought a new place to meet in, *in caſe they had been* diſappointed of the other; ſince he knows, and it is evident that they were *not diſappointed* of the other, and yet they left the Afternoons Meeting at the Bank, and met at the *other* place which they had provided, though the *Meeting-houſe* at the Bank was *open*, and Friends met therein, as they were wont to do in other Summers. This manifeſts, he and his Party had a deſign of Separation, in that they would neither *go with the Meeting* to the Centre in the Forenoon, nor *ſtay with it* at the Bank in the Afternoon; both which they ſhould have done, if they

they would have obſerved the uſual Courſe of the Meeting, *according to former Practice.* This will yet further appear by *G. K*'s following words, viz. *And though ſome of us did declare our ſincere intention and ſenſe, that it were good but to have one publick Meeting on Firſt Days, to end about the ſecond hour, and the remaining part to be uſed for private Meetings in Families, yet their keeping up their publick Afternoons Meeting, hath given us juſt occaſion at preſent to have a publick Afternoons Meeting as well as they.* Reaſ. of Separ. p. 16. By this it appears that *G. K.* and his Party would have *aſſumed a Power* to alter, chop, change, appoint, pull down, ſet up Meetings, as they pleaſed. They would have *pulled down* the publick Afternoon Meeting, and *laid it quite aſide*, and have *ſet up* private Meetings in Families inſtead thereof: But the Friends would not part with their publick Meeting ſo. This was a ſettled, eſtabliſhed Meeting; the Friends did not then ſet up a new Meeting of their own Heads, but they kept up their old *ſettled* publick Meeting, *as before.* And for their ſo doing, he charges them with beginning the Separation, ſaying, p. 15. *They began the Separation in keeping a publick Meeting in the Afternoon at the Bank, contrary to our declared ſenſe and mind.* Obſerve, he ſays in keeping, not in ſetting up, but in keeping up that Meeting which had been ſet up long before. This publick Meeting which he blames the Friends for *keeping*, was the old conſtant ſettled Meeting, which he would have *thrown down*, and ſet up private Family-meetings inſtead of. (By which, Friends, ye may clearly ſee how unjuſt

he is, in charging the Friends there with beginning the Separation.) And when he found the Friends would not let go their publick Meeting, nor *change it* for his private Family-meeting, then *he withdrew* himself and his Party, and *refused to meet with the Friends* in their old publick Afternoons Meeting; and in pursuance of his own project, for setting up private Family-meetings, he and they that joined with him, *set up* first a private Family-meeting in his own House, (*some of us*, says he, *met at a private Family-meeting in the Evening, at the House of* G. K.) but finding this would not do, but that the publick Afternoons Meeting would bear this down, he then would have a publick Afternoons Meeting too; yet would not meet with the Friends in their publick Afternoons Meeting, (which was the old settled Meeting) but having provided *another place* to meet in *in opposition* to the Friends Meeting, he and his Party *assume a Power* to set up *another* publick Afternoons Meeting too, in opposition to the Afternoons Meeting of Friends. Can any thing bear a more exact Character of Separation than this? Thus he who just before said, *Some of us did declare our sincere intention and sense, that it were good but to have one publick Meeting on First Days*, forthwith sets up another, that he might have two *like his Neighbours*. If his sense was that it was *good to have but one*, why did he not keep to that sense? If his Intention of having but one was *sincere*, why did he depart from that Intention, and set up two? Do h not this shew that either his Intention and Sense were not sincere, or he was not sincere in de-

departing from them? Nay, the Reason he gives for his setting up that publick Afternoons Meeting, contrary to his declared Intention and Sense, plainly shews *he was not sincere*. It is this, *For we hope they shall not have any cause to say against us, that we are short of them in our Zeal for good Meetings*. See here the ground of their setting up their publick Afternoons Meeting! Not a sincere, godly, conscientious ground, respecting the Honour of God, the propagation of Truth, the Edification and Benefit of the Church. But a *political*, *popular*, worldly ground, respecting his own Reputation and Honour, that he, and they with him, might not *be thought less Zealous*, than the Friends they had separated from; and that he might increase, at least keep, and strengthen his Party. *We hope* (says he) *they shall not have any cause to say against us, that we are short of them in our Zeal for good Meetings*. Doth he not use the word (*good*) here to deceive and abuse his Reader? He declared his sense before that it was *good* to have but one publick Meeting on First Days; then it was *not good*, in his sense, *to have two*; but rather than he will *come behind*, or be thought less Zealous than those whom he opposes, he will have two publick Meetings a Day, as well as they, and call them *both good* too, though against his own before declared sence. Is there any thing like *Sincerity* in this? From whence sprang his Zeal for those good Meetings (as he calls them) but from Imitation, or *Envy* and *Strife*? The Friends had two publick Meetings during the Summer on the

First

First Days, he thought it was *good to have but one*, and would have had them *let one fall*; they would not looſe one of their Meetings; when he ſaw that, he ſet up another Meeting too, that he might have as many as they. See now the Root of his Zeal for good Meetings. But to return to the Separation.

I think what is already ſaid may ſatisfy any reaſonable Perſon, that *G. K. began, and is in* the Separation. But to make it yet further appear, how unjuſt he is in charging the Separation upon Friends there, I ſhall inſtance ſome paſſages in his own Book, which plainly ſhews not only that he and his Party are in the Separation, but that he endeavours to Juſtify it. Indeed, the very Title of his Book is enough of it ſelf to ſhew on whom the Separation lies, it being, **Some Reaſons and Cauſes of the late Separation**, *&c.* For if the Friends had made the Separation, what reaſon had *G. K.* who is their Oppoſer, to undertake the *Defence of it*, and to bring forth *Reaſons for it?* He knew the Separation was *his own Work*, and therefore he wrote that Book to defend it. And in p. 17. he ſays, *A third and main Reaſon that we give for this Separation, well, Warranted both by Scripture Teſtimony*, and *command of Chriſt*, &c. Here he pretends, to give a Reaſon for the Separation (though it be a *Falſe* Reaſon, *viz.* That Groſs and Unchriſtian Errors are tolerated and upheld by the Society of Friends there) which ſhews *he takes the Separation upon himſelf*: For it were an apparent *Self-condemnation* in him to ſay, the Friends had Separated from him, and that their ſo Separating was well war-

warranted by Scripture and Command of Christ. He muſt be underſtood therefore to mean, that the Separation which *he and his have made* is well warranted, *&c.* And towards the Bottom of the ſame page, citing divers Scripturers (moſt of which are nothing to his purpoſe) he ſays, *now the Scripture that warrant* US *in this Separation, &c.* This is a ſufficient *Warrant* ſure to lay the Separation *at his Doore*; for here is a plain acknowledgment that *he is in it*, though he idlely pretends that others began it. In p. 22. he ſays, *We are convinced and perſwaded in our Conciences, that God calleth us to Separate from ſuch unbelievers, and not to be Yoaked together in Church-Fellowſhip and Diſcipline with any, that we have not proof of by confeſſion of the mouth, that they are ſound in Faith*, &c. This ſure is a full proof not only that they are in the Separation, but that *they began it*: For if the Friends (whom he calls Unbeleivers) had firſt Separated from them, then how couldhe ſay God called them to Separate from the Unbeleivers when the Unbelievers (in his ſenſe) had Separated from them before? A Separation from a thing or Perſon inplies, a being joyned to that thing or Perſon *before*, and *till* ſuch Separation be made. But if the Friends there had begun the Separation before, then they had thereby disjoyned themſelves from *G. K.* and his Party, and *G. K.* and his Party could not have afterwards Separated from them, becauſe they were not then joyned to them; conſequently it could not be that God ſhould call them to Separate from the others, if the others had Separated themſelves from them before. If therefore they are convinced and perſwaded in

their

their Consciences (as *G. K.* says they are) that God called them to Separate from these whom he calls Unbelievers, and that they answered that Call, they must then acknowledge that *they began the Separation.* And that they did so, his following words shew, p. 23. where he says, *We have great clearness and peace in the Lord, to retire and separate from such disorderly Walkers and Talkers as we have formerly done from other Professions.* Hence it appears the Friends kept their standing, stood their ground; and *G. K.* and his Party retired, drew back, or withdrew, and separated themselves, and that purposely and with design to separate; for he adds, (a little after) *Yet we design not any Separation from our faithful Brethren here, or any where else. A Separation* then it seems *they did design* (tho' not from such as they account *their* faithful Brethren, such as will stick faithfully to them, and approve them in their Separation) and having designed it, they began it, (withdrawing themselves from the usual settled Meeting of Friends, and setting up first a private Family-meeting in *G. K.*'s House, afterwards publick Meetings in an House provided for that purpose) and having begun it, they continue it, and *G. K.* hath written that Book called, *Some Reasons and Causes of the late Separation*, to justifie and defend it.

Thus, Friends, I have given you such an Account of this matter, as I have been able to gather, both from the discourse that was had upon it at the Yearly Meeting, and *G. K.*'s own printed Book concerning it. And as I doubt not but this will satisfie you, and all who seek the plain

and

and *naked truth*; ſo if any will ſhut their Eyes againſt ſo clear Evidence and Demonſtration, I ſhall rather pity than contend with ſuch.

In the tracing this matter through *G. K*'s Book, I obſerve he makes a great *noiſe* and *outcry* of groſs and vile Errors held by ſome, and them upheld by others, which he gives for one Reaſon or Cauſe of the Separation. But in as much as this is only his Charge, without due proof; and the Perſons, by him charged with thoſe vile Errors, are not here preſent, to make Anſwer to his Charge, and defend themſelves, or to ſhew the *Occaſions* that led to, and *Circumſtances* that attended thoſe Diſcourſes, from which he pickt the words he charges them with, and to *explain their meanings* therein, I have not thought it fit, or becoming me, *on no better ground*, to meddle with thoſe matters, being alike unwilling to juſtifie them, if in any thing they have done or ſaid amiſs, as to condemn them unheard upon the report of another, and him their profeſſed Adverſary. But if I ſhould judge of his Dealing with the reſt, by what I find he hath done by one of them, *viz. William Southebe*. I might well conclude his Outcry againſt them, for holding and cloaking groſs and vile Errors, hath more of noiſe in it, than real ground for it. For by a Letter which I have ſeen, written in the Seventh Month 1692. from *W. Southebe* to *G. Keith* and others, I find, that *G. K.* having charged him with *denying any general Day of Judgment, and the Reſurrection of the Dead, but only what every one witneſſeth within here*; W. Southebe *ſolemnly denies the Charge*,

calls that Doctrine *Damnable* and *Atheistical*, declares that *he believes the Resurrection, according to the* Scriptures, *and the Ancient Doctrine of Friends concerning it*; and shews how *G. K.* framed that Charge against him, only from his saying (in private Conference with him) that he did not own it now, in or after *the same manner*, as he did when he was a *Papist* (he had been a *Papist*, it seems, before he received the Truth:) *For then*, says he, *I owned it very carnally and outward*, viz. *That the great Judgment should be in an outward Valley, called the Valley of* Jehoshaphat, *in the Land of* Israel; *and that we should see with these outward Eyes: But I believe now it will be more spiritual.* And in the same Paper, he declares his Faith thus, *viz. I believe in God, the Father Almighty, Creator of Heaven and Earth, and in Jesus Christ, his only* Son, *our only blessed* Saviour, *who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin* Mary, *suffered under* Pontius Pilate, *was crucified, dead and laid in a* Sepulchre, *arose again the third Day from the Dead, was conversant Forty Days with his Disciples, ascended into Heaven, sitteth at the Right Hand of the Majesty on High; and that every one must appear before his Judgment-seat to receive their Reward, according to their Deeds done in this mortal Body, even at that great and dreadful Day of a general Account, &c.* Is it not strange, that this Man should be charged with denying the General Day of Judgment, and the Resurrection of the Dead! In another Paper also, which I have seen, subscribed by *Tho. Lloyd*, *Arthur Cook*, *Samuel Jenings*, and *John Delavall*, on behalf of themselves, and *many others*, and directed

rected to *G. Keith* himself, I find they say, *As to Unity in Doctrine, so much seemingly profest by you, to the amusing of many unwary People, we hereby sincerely declare, that we are herein one with our ancient and faithful Brethren, firmly believing what is upon Record in the holy Scriptures, concerning God, concerning our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, both with respect to his Appearance in the Flesh, and to his Appearance in the Spirit; concerning the Holy Ghost, the Resurrection-state, and Eternal Judgment. Which, though offered unto you, to the same purpose, and that several times; yet was rejected, as insufficient, by you.* Some of these are the men he charges with either holding or cloaking the gross and vile Errors, damnable Heresies, and Doctrines of Devils, which he fills his Books with Clamour against, and that in some of the Doctrines here mentioned. What likelihood of Truth there is in that Charge, as to *their holding* such gross Errors, I leave you, my Friends, to consider, having given you what the Persons themselves say, under their own Hands. And as to *covering or cloaking gross Errors, &c.* (which is the other part of his Charge) I observe the same Persons, in the same Paper, say, *We offer unto you, That if any of us, or any countenanced by us, have given you any offence, either by any unsound Expressions, or by any ungospel-like Conversation, and the same be made to appear by Credible Testimonies, We promise unto you, that if the Parties concerned do not condemn the same, they shall be disowned therein.* But that which, with me, hath abated much of the Noise of his Clamour against the Errors of others, especially as to his making

them a Cauſe or Reaſon of his Separation, is, that after the Separation was actually begun, and he and his Party met apart from Friends, he went to the Friends Meeting, (as he ſays himſelf, *Reaſons of the Separation*, p. 28.) and did there declare that *He and his Friends had Unity with the moſt there, as to the main.* Now if there had been ſuch *groſs, vile,* and *unchriſtian* Errors, againſt the *Fundamental* Doctrines of the Chriſtian Faith, ſuch *Damnable* Hereſies and *Doctrines of Devils,* held amongſt them, as he ſuggeſts, and cloakt or covered, and *tolerated* by them, how could he ſay that he and his Friends had unity with the *moſt* there, *as to the main*? Truly, with me, his going to the Friends Meeting, after he had *retired* (as his word is) and *ſeparated* from them, and telling them, *he and his Friends had unity with the moſt there, as to the main,* hath *mainly* abated his Clamourous Charge againſt the Friends of that Meeting, for holding and tolerating groſs, vile and unchriſtian Errors, againſt the Fundamental Doctrines of the Chriſtian Faith. But indeed I do not ſee with what pretence of Reaſon he can juſtifie himſelf, in ſeparating from that *whole* Society, or Meeting of Friends, with the moſt of whom he declared he had *Unity* in the *main,* even after he had ſeparated from them.

But leaving what is already ſaid, to your judicious and weighty Conſideration, my dear Friends, for whoſe Information I have undertaken this work, I ſhall now make ſome further Obſervations on ſome other paſſages in *G. K*'s late Book called, *The Cauſeleſs Ground of Surmiſes,*

miſes, *Jealouſies*, *and unjuſt Offences removed*; which very Title carries in it a *Reflection* upon Friends, and the Yearly Meeting particularly, as if he had given *no Juſt* Offence by the Separation he has made, and the Scandalous Books he has printed; but Friends had taken Offence thereat *unjuſtly*, and without cauſe.

In that Book he ſays, p. 1. *In the firſt place, I cannot but greatly blame them, who have reprinted divers of my late Books, with other Titles than the Titles firſt given them.* To print, or reprint any thing of anothers, with other Titles, or the ſame, without his conſent or leave, is indeed a thing to be blamed. But if he were *impartially* Juſt, he would in the firſt place have *blamed himſelf*, for publiſhing in print the Diviſions among the Quakers in *Penſilvania* (which he himſelf had the chief hand in making) and his, or his Printers, or others of his Party, their ſending the Books over hither to be ſpread, thereby giving both opportunity, and a ſort of Invitation or Incouragement to the Adverſaries of Truth here, to reprint them, making that the Title, which they found to be the Contents and Deſign of the Books, and of the ſending them thither, *viz.* to give an Account of the Diviſions amongſt the Quakers in *Penſilvania*. For it is to be noted, that conſiderable numbers of thoſe Books, which *G. K.* hath written in *America* (laying open the Diviſion and Differences betwixt him and Friends there, and expoſing both many particular Perſons, and whole Meetings of Friends, to the Scorn of the World, in the moſt *Reproachful* terms and manner) were ſent over

hither, consigned to one of *London*, (who is well known not to be, or ever hath been in the Profession, or under the Denomination of a Quaker) and left to him to expose them to sale as he would, by the Booksellers of the Town, or the **Hawkers**, who cry the idle Pamphlets about the Streets. Judge then who was most worthy of blame, they that sent them in that manner hither, or they that having the disposing of them, or to whose hands any of them came, reprinted them with such fresh Titles as they thought most sutable to them. And indeed I do not observe *G. K.* blames any for reprinting or spreading his Books here, but only for reprinting them with other Titles than those he had at first given them. Of which that which he seems most to resent, is that they gave to one of his Treatises this Title, **The Christian Quaker, or** George Keith's **Eyes opened**, *as if* (says he) *the Name Christian Quaker were peculiar to me, and some few others called Quakers, or as if I had been formerly blind till of late days*; the but supposing of which, doth so sensibly touch him, that he takes occasion from thence to tell the World how long it is since his Eyes were opened. But when he comes to apply the Name Christian, he is very *cold* and *stiff*, and does it very *scantily*. *It is my charitable sincere Perswasion* (says he, p. 2.) *that the worthy Name of* **Christian** *doth truly belong to very many of that People, as well as unto me.* He will not allow it (it seems) to the People called Quakers, or to the Body of Friends, as a People, no not so much as from a Charitable Perswasion: And how sincere he is

in

in pretending to allow it to *very many* of that People, his following words ſhew, for he adds, *Having an experimental proof, through intimate Converſation, and frequent verbal Communication with many of them, that they are ſincere in the Chriſtian Faith* &c. See now to what a *narrow ſcantling* he has reduced his appiication of the Name *Chriſtian* among the Quakers, and how *few* he meant by *very many*; even juſt ſo many as he hath an Experimental proof of, through *intimate Converſation*, and *frequent verbal Communication* with them, which how many they may be, judge ye, conſidering how ſhort a time he had then been in *England*, and in that time ſcarce or little out of *London*, nor very converſant with Friends there.

His ſaying p. 2. *It hath been ſaid, that he hath Printed ſeveral Books againſt the People called Quakers, charging them with holding and cloaking more damnable Hereſies and Doctrines of Devils, than any Proteſtant Profeſſion would Tolerate; but that, a great ſearch having been made by many into all his Printed Books, it hath not been found*, and *he ſays it is not to be found, that any where in all his Books he hath charged the People called Quakers either in general, or in the plurality, with any ſuch things*; This I ſay, has more of Art than *Plainneſs* in it. It may poſſibly, yea probably be ſo, that he hath not charged thoſe things upon the people called Quakers in *thoſe very Terms*, of either in *general*, or in the *plurality*. But certain it is that he hath laid his charge in *ſuch* terms, and after *ſuch* a manner, as hath given occaſion and advantage to all ſorts of Truths Adverſaries, whether envious Profeſſors, Profane Scoffers, or old cankered A-

postates, to reproach the People called Quakers in *general* with it: So that by means of his *scandalous* Books, the Holy Name of God hath been greatly Dishonoured, the precious Truth and way thereof despised, and the Friends thereof reviled and vilified in the Nations. This Friends, ye know, by sad experience, and to your Grief and Sorrow, in the several Cities, Towns and Places where ye dwell, or deal. ,This is that hurt and disservice to Truth, which the Yearly Meeting had a deep and weighty Sence of, and in the Sence thereof advised *G. K.* either to *call in those Books, or at least publish something innocently, and effectually, to clear the Body of the People called Quakers, and their Ministers, from those gross Errors charged on some few in America.* Which he hath hitherto been so far from doing, that as he here says, it hath not been found in all his Books, that he hath charged the People called Quakers either in *General*, or in the *Plurality*: So I may say, I have not found in this last Book, which he hath published since the Yearly Meeting, that he hath cleared or attempted to clear, the People called Quakers, either in *General* or in the *Plurality*; Nay he is scarce willing to allow the Name Christian to any more of them, than he has had Experimental proof of, through intimate Conversation, and frequent verbal Communication with them (as I noted before) so contracted and narrow is his Charity towards Friends. 'Tis true, he quotes a passage or two out of his former Book, called *Some Reason*, &c. *of the late Separation*, pretending that he hath therein cleared the Qunkers in general;

general; but his ſtile there alſo is ambiguous and equivocal: For he mentions not Quaker or Friends in *General*, or Friends *Indefinitely*, but ſays, *We remain in dear Unity with* our *faithful Friends*, and *we are one with* our *faithful Brethren in all parts of the World*, and this after he had made his Separation from Friends there. How then could theſe Expreſſions ſerve to clear Friends in *General*, when they have a reſtrictive application to ſuch as ſhould prove faithful to them in their Separation.

That which he ſays is *Greatly to be noticed*, has nothing worthy of note in it, *viz. That notwithſtanding the objections and ſevere Accuſations that ſome have made againſt my late Books, and a ſtrict Examination of them, by ſome that have ſo complained, there is not any line or ſentence in any of them, that they have made to appear to contain any Untruth or Falſhood in them, either in matter of Doctrine or Fact.* I ſay, this has *nothing of note* in it: For (ſuppoſing it were true in Fact, that no Untruth or Falſhood in matter of Fact, had been diſcovered in his Books) it was not the proper Buſineſs of the Yearly Meeting (which here, as elſewhere, he Strikes at) to judge of the matters of Fact, contained in his Books, which were alledged to have been done in *America*, by Perſons not here to anſwer to, or give account of them. Yet that there is Untruth or Falſhood in his Books, in matter of Fact, with reſpect to his vain endeavours therein to caſt the Separation off from himſelf, and lay it upon Friends, did appear in the opening and ſtating that matter in the Yearly Meeting, and will, I believe more fully appear

by

by what is herein written on that Subject Therefore let none think that becauſe the Yearly Meeting did not declare the Matters of Fact in his Books to be falſe, therefore they are *all true. They remain to be proved by him that has affirmed them; and to be anſwered by them who are charged therein.* The Matter then before the Meeting was the *hurt* and *miſchief* thoſe Books of his had done, the great *diſhonour* to God, *diſſervice* to Truth, *reproach* and *grief* to Friends, the printing and publiſhing thoſe Books had brought. Nor did it, or can it excuſe him, to ſay his Books are but an *improper and accidental Cauſe of the Hurt done by them*; ſince it is apparent they are *the proper and direct Cauſe thereof.* The Hurt, the Miſchief, the Diſhonour, Reproach, Grief, that have thereby fallen on the Holy Name of God, his Truth and People reſpectively, are the *proper and direct Effects* of the printing and publiſhing thoſe Scandalous Books of his; nor could any good Effects have been produced, or reaſonably expected from them, whatever he may pretend. And indeed, it appears by the *Apology* made for the publiſhing of them, that he himſelf had ſome ſenſe and foreſight of the Miſchief they were likely to do, when he ſaid, (Reaſ. of Separation, p. 2.) *It is too probable the Enemies of Truth, and of all true Religion, will ſeek to take advantage therefrom, and think themſelves greatly gratified thereby, ſo as to rejoice the more in their Iniquity, and glory over the ſincere Lovers and Profeſſors of Truth:* Which makes his Iniquity in publiſhing them the greater.

But

But it is evident he has been so far from endeavouring to *wipe away* the Reproach his Scandalous Books have cast on Truth and Friends, that in his last he hath sought occasions, by *secret Flurts*, to *throw more on*; suggesting as if the Yearly Meeting (in opposition to whose Advice to him, this late Book of his is apparently levelled) was guilty of covering or cloaking those vile Errors he exclaims against, and of lessening them with the *smooth Name of Weakness*. This he hath done by a sly way of *Insinuating*: But in that which came out a little before with R. *Hannay*'s Name to it, (in which, to shew their Art and Delight in Dividing, they endeavour to represent the Yearly Meeting also as divided) the Reader is told, that therein *he shall find a Party of them of the Yearly Meeting at* London, *are proved guilty of endeavouring to cloak and cover the Antichristian Errors, and Persecuting Practices of their Apostate Brethren in* Pensilvania, referring for proof to certain Queries there following, which for matter are much what the same with that other Book which *G. K*'s Name is to.

And in this last, p. 3. *G. K.* insinuates as if *those great and necessary Doctrines, there and in his other Books mentioned, concerning the Man Christ Jesus, his dying for our sins, rising again, ascending in the true and perfect Nature of Man, and being in Heaven our High-Priest, Mediator and Advocate with the Father*, &c. *And that by this Man Jesus Christ, God will raise the Dead, and Judge the World at the last Day. And that the Deceased Saints have not yet (generally) received the Re-*

surrection

ſurrection of the Body, but wait for it at Chriſt's l
Coming and Appearance without us in his glorified B
dy, to Judge the quick and the dead. I ſay he i
ſinuates, as if theſe Doctrines had been dead a
buried among the Quakers. For he ſays, p.
Hundreds of Friends have ſignified their great ſat
faction and joy, that God had raiſed me up, and ſo
others with me, to appear in a Zealous, plain a
clear Teſtimony to thoſe great Truths of Chriſtia
ty, plainly aſſerted in my late Books, &c. *And h*
bleſſed God, on our behalf, for his giving us Z
and Courage to appear in ſuch a publick Teſtimony
theſe great Truths of Chriſt that had been as it w
buried in ſilence by ſome, and oppoſed by others,
reviving and raiſing up *of which, God*
pleaſed to ſhew me in a Heavenly Viſion, that
would make me an Inſtrument thereof, &c. H
great and high a Charge is implied in theſe wo
againſt the Quakers in general! What *ſaving*
here, what *Exception* made, either of the Q
kers in general, or in the plurality, or inde
of any at all. Theſe great important Doctri
of Chriſtianity he repreſents as *buried in ſile*
by ſome, oppoſed by others; nay, that they w
let fall and become dead among the Quakers, f
he ſays, he was raiſed up and made an Inſtr
ment to *revive* and *raiſe up* theſe Doctrines
gain: Now ye know, Friends, that *reviving* i
plies *a bringing to life again that which was de*
and a *raiſing up* implies that the thing to be r
ſed up was *fallen down.* Judge now what a
ceited Opinion this man hath of himſelf, a
what *evil thoughts* he hath let in concerni
Friends, that he could thus let fly a Slande
whi

which affects not only all our Miniſtring Friends, the many faithful, worthy and honourable Labourers in the Lord's Vineyard) but even the Body of Friends in general, as if they had ſuffered thoſe great and weighty Doctrines of Chriſtinity to fall and die amongſt us, ſo that there needed one to be raiſed up on purpoſe to revive and raiſe them up again. But Friends, ye know, and are Witneſſes (and the Spirit of the Lord, know doth and will bear witneſs with and to our Spirits, as to mine) that this *ſuggeſtion* is as *falſe* as it is *foul*. For theſe great and weighty Doctrines not only always (ſince we were a People) have been, but ſtill are at this day owned, received, believed, confeſſed to, and acknowledged by the Body of Friends, and declared and ſet forth in our publick Meetings, in the openings of the *Divine Life*, and in the movings, guidance and direction of the *Holy Spirit*, which is the Heavenly *Key*, by which God opens his *Divine Treaſures* to, and through his Servants. This, my Brethren, ye know: And if it ſhall be objected, that thoſe Doctrines relating to the Birth, Death, Reſurrection, Aſcention, *&c.* of Chriſt as to the *Outward Body*, are not ſo frequently or conſtantly declared or held forth in our publick Meetings, as thoſe that relate to the inward Appearance and Work of Chriſt in the Heart. Ye know alſo, that the Servant is not to frame his Meſſage himſelf, but to deliver the Meſſage his Lord gives him to deliver; and as the Miniſters of Chriſt may not ſpeak *when* they will, but muſt ſpeak *when* their Lord bids them; ſo neither may they ſpeak *what*

they

they will, but must speak *what* he gives 'em t
speak; who is not to be directed by Man, bu
is to be the Director of Man; and is so of a
them that wait aright upon him, to receive th
word from his Mouth. And if any should won
der, and reason in themselves, why those Do
ctrines relating to the *outward* Appearance an
Work of Christ for our Redemption, are no
so *frequently* opened, and insisted on in public
Meetings, as the other that relate to his *inwar*
Appearance, and Work of Sanctification in th
Heart; let such consider, that the Dispensatio
we have received from God is the Dispensatio
of the same Gospel, which was committed t
the Apostles of our Lord, and to the Saints o
old: The Doctrines whereof (as well tho
that related to the outward Appearance an
Work of Christ in the Flesh, as those that rela
ted to his inward Appearance and Work o
Sanctification in the Hearts of his People) were
in the first Ages of the Christian Church full
and clearly held forth, received and believed
And although in the succeeding Ages, as th
Apostacy from the Life and Power of *Christian*
gained place, and corruptions crept in and pre
vailed, whereby a thick Cloud of Darkness cam
to be spread over the Church, for many hun
dred Years (which Protestants acknowledge
the *inward* Appearance and Manifestation o
Christ by his Spirit in the Heart, was *departe*
from, and the Doctrines thereof generally lo
and forgotten: Yet the Doctrines relating t
the *outward* Appearance of Christ in the Flesh
and what he therein did and suffered for Man
Re

Redemption, were not loſt, but retained and preached, through all Ages, and by every Sort or Sect of Profeſſed Chriſtians; inſomuch that *G. K.* now calls thoſe Doctrines, which he pretends to be raiſed up to revive and raiſe up, ſuch Doctrines as are held in common by us, with all other Profeſſions. Now when it pleaſed God to raiſe up and ſend forth a true Goſpel Miniſtry again, in this latter Age of the World, to reſtore true Chriſtianity to the World again, and to gather out of the many Profeſſions a peculiar People to himſelf; it was agreeable to the Divine Wiſdom, to bring to light that which had been *hidden*, to reſtore to the Nations that which had been *loſt*, to turn People to that which they had been *turned from*, to inſtruct them in that which they were moſt *ignorant of*, which was the *inward* Appearance, Manifeſtation and Work of Chriſt, by his Light, Grace and Spirit in the Heart, for the Sanctification and Salvation of Men. Hence (with reverence and ſubmiſſion to the Supream Diſpoſer) I conceive it hath come to paſs, that they whom the Lord hath ſent forth to preach the Everlaſting Goſpel in this Day, have been led and guided by him, to teach People that which they knew not, rather than that which they profeſſt to know before; to open thoſe Doctrines of Life and Salvation, which the People were *ignorant of*, and Strangers to, rather than thoſe which they were acquainted with, and had been all along trained up in. And this I take to be the reaſon why, though theſe Doctrines, which *G. K.* ſays we hold in common with other Profeſſions

feſſions, have always from the beginning been aſſerted, and on all occaſions maintained and defended, and ſometimes more particularly opened; yet thoſe Doctrines that reſpect the *inward* Appearance and Manifeſtation of Chriſt Jeſus, by his Light, Grace and Spirit ſhining and working in the Hearts of Men and Women, from the beginning, carrying on, and perfecting the Work of Regeneration, Sanctification and Salvation, have been more largely inſiſted on, and more frequently inculcated to the Hearers, as being Doctrines either not at all, or not rightly underſtood by thoſe of other Profeſſions, and for that reaſon diſallowed and oppoſed by moſt. And ſurely this can be no cauſe of wonder, much leſs of ſtumbling, to any that ſhall well conſider the conſiſtency of it with right Reaſon, and its agreeableneſs to the End for which the Miniſtry is given, *viz. to turn People from Darkneſs to the Light*, to inform and inſtruct them in thoſe neceſſary Truths which they are moſt ignorant of and to bring them to know the *inward* Myſtery, of Chriſt being formed in them, and ſo becoming the hope of Glory to them; as they before knew, and profeſſed the Hiſtory and Doctrines of the *outward* Myſtery of Chriſt's Incarnation, Birth, Paſſion, Reſurrection, Aſcention, Mediatorſhip, *&c.* And therefore, dear Friends, I cannot but think, (and conclude that ye alſo will think) *G. K.* the more to be blamed, in taking occaſion to *ſtumble and cavil* at this, and giving thereby occaſion to the Adverſaries of Truth, in all Profeſſions, to *ſtumble and cavil alſo*, who had no *ground* for their Jealouſies

louſies and Diſſatisfactions *before*. For though he, to excuſe his Books, pretend *they have been, and will be of great ſervice for the removing thoſe Jealouſies and Diſſatisfactions that many of all other Profeſſions have entertained againſt us, occaſioned* (he ſays) *either by the obſcure and unwary Expreſſions of ſome of the ſame Profeſſion with us, or by the ignorance or unſoundneſs of ſome others*: Yet it is plain enough, that whatever Jealouſies or Diſſatisfactions any of other Profeſſions had entertained againſt us, on this account before, they had no ground nor occaſion given them therefore; whereas now *he has given them occaſion*, though unjuſtly and without cauſe, to entertain *wrong* Jealouſies of us; wherein the *real diſſervice* and miſchief of his Books is far greater, than his *imagined ſervice* could be. And he, by paſſing that *raſh* Cenſure, of obſcure and unwary Expreſſions upon ſome, and Ignorance or Unſoundneſs upon ſome others, of the ſame Profeſſion with us, has ſhew'd *a proud Conceit* of himſelf, rendred himſelf an *Accuſer of the Brethren*, and an *Informer againſt them*, and taken upon him to abet and juſtifie the Jealouſies and Diſſatisfactions of our Adverſaries, which none but an *Adverſary*, how *covertly* ſoever *maſked* for a Friend, would have done.

But this ſort of *Detraction* is ſo grateful to his Humour, that he forbears not publickly in his late Book, p. 10. to propoſe *the noting, correcting, and amending of whatever weak, and unſound or unjuſtifiable Expreſſions, Sayings, or Paſſages are to be found in any Books among us, that have hapned through human Weakneſs, or Inadvertency, that are*

offensive and stumbling to other Professions, and hurtful to the weak among our selves; whereby he suggests that such unsound or unjustifiable Expressions there are in Friends Books, and he pretends that this correcting work (which his Fingers seem to itch to be doing) would be an imitation of the Example of blessed *Sem* and *Japhet*, *who taking a garment went backward, and covered their Fathers nakedness*. But he should remember and consider, that blessed *Sem* and *Japhet* did therefore go backward, that they might *not see* their Fathers nakedness, which *execrable* Ham *had discovered and exposed*, and was therefore by his Father cursed. Whereas his Proposition of *going backward* (to revise and correct the Books of Friends) is with purpose to *hunt for*, *discover* and *expose*, if he can, the *nakedness* of such, as in comparison of himself, may justly be reputed and called Fathers in the Truth; wherein he has greatly *mistook his point*, and has taken up *Ham*'s work, instead of *Sem*'s and *Japhet*'s. But for all his talk elsewhere, p. 9. of the Collections he has made out of Friends printed Books, he doth not seem here to have been heedfully conversant in them, when he says, *Is it not high time that by the general consent, advice and approbation of the most judicious, wise and understanding Friends now alive, all the most necessary Principles and Doctrines of our Faith, both common and peculiar, should be published and made known.* Is that, as a *new* thing, to be done now? What Principle, or Doctrine of our Faith, either common or peculiar, can he assign, that hath not been published and made known, perhaps

haps before he knew either our Faith or us, as early as he endeavours to render himself amongst us?

In his eighth and ninth pages, he labours to acquit himself from having imposed upon Friends in Matters relating to Faith or Discipline. He mentions *a Form of Confession*, which he calls, *An Account of our sincere Faith*, which he says he writ, but never imposed. He mentions also another Paper of his called, *Gospel Order and Discipline improved*, which he would not have taken for *imposition*, because he says it was propounded by way of *Query*. But if this be the same which I saw at the Yearly Meeting, among many other particulars in it, tending to run us into the Professors *formal way* of Church-Fellowship and Communion, one is to make a *verbal Confession* of our Principle and Chief Doctrines, the *Door of Admittance* into our Society, either by making a *Declaration* thereof at length, or by answering *Yea*, or *Nay* to *Questions* put for that end. And though that whole Paper be, as he saith, proposed by way of *Query*, from whence he would infer it is no *imposition*; yet, with respect to a *verbal Confession* of Faith, I observe he says in p. 22. of his Reasons and Causes of the late Separation, *We are convinced and perswaded in our Consciences, that God calleth us to separate from such Unbelievers, and not to be yoked together in Church-Fellowship and Discipline with any that we have not proof of by Confession of the Mouth, that they are found in Faith, touching these necessary and fundamental parts of Christian Doctrine.* By which if I do not, as I would not, and think I do not,

miſtake him) *he impoſes a verbal Confeſſion of* Faith upon all, who would be admitted into his Society, which is a principal Article in his Paper before-mentioned, called, *Goſpel Order and Diſcipline improved.*

In what he infers from *R. Barclay* he *miſtakes* him, I ſuppoſe: I am ſure he *wrongs* him. He ſays p. 8. *That ſome Principles and Doctrines, and Points of Faith are neceſſary to be agreed upon, together with the Practices neceſſarily depending thereupon, and to be owned, profeſſed and declared by us, to be as it were, the Terms that draw us together, and the Bond by which we become centred into one Body and Fellowſhip, and diſtinguiſhed from others, (yet not this ſo the Bond, but that we have a more inward and inviſible, to wit, the Life of Righteouſneſs) is the expreſs Doctrine and Teſtimony of* R. Barclay *his Book, called,* The Anarchy, &c. p. 48. Theſe are neither *R. B*'s words nor ſenſe in that place. His words are theſe; *We being gathered together into the Belief of certain Principles and Doctrines, without any conſtraint or worldly reſpect, but by the meer force of Truth upon our underſtanding, and its power and influence upon our Hearts: theſe Principles and Doctrines, and the Practices neceſſarily depending upon them, are as it were the Terms that have drawn us together, and the Bond by which we became centred into one Body and Fellowſhip, and diſtinguiſhed from others. Yet this not ſo the Bond, but that we have alſo a more inward and inviſible, to wit, the Life of Righteouſneſs,* &c. Now obſerve, *R. B.* doth not here ſay, as *G. K.* ſays his expreſs Doctrine and Teſtimony here is, that ſome Principles, and Doctrines, and Points

of

of Faith *are neceſſary to be agreed on*, (as if Men were to contrive and *cut out their own Terms*, and before they entred into a Society or Fellowſhip, ſhould conſider, conſult and conclude among themſelves what Principles, Doctrines and Practices they would have to be the Terms and Bond of their Society) much leſs that an owning, profeſſing and declaring thoſe Principles, Doctrines and Practices, ſhould be the Terms of that Communion. But that thoſe Principles and Doctrines, and the Practices neceſſarily depending upon them, which we, *by the meer force of Truth upon our Underſtanding, and its power and influence upon our Hearts*, without any conſtraint or worldly reſpect, are gathered into the belief of, are *as it were* the Terms and Bond, *&c.* So that he does not make a *bare Profeſſion, verbal Confeſſion*, or *Declaration* of thoſe Principles, Doctrines and Practices to be *any Terms at all*. The Principles, Doctrines and Practices themſelves, he calls not the Terms and Bond *ſtrictly* or *properly*, but *as it were*. But the Terms and Bond, ſtrictly and properly ſpeaking, are, with *R. B. The Life of Righteouſneſs*, which is inward and inviſible. So that from this place of *R. B.* rightly given, and truly ſtated, *G. K.* hath no ſtrength or countenance for impoſing a verbal Confeſſion or Declaration of Principles, Doctrines, and Points of Faith, as Terms of Fellowſhip among us.

But I obſerve he uſes to make bold with his *Country-man R. B.* by the Credit of his Name to *impoſe* upon his unwary Reader. For in his Book, called, *Some Reaſons and Cauſes of the late*

Sepa-

Separation, p. 16. he proposes, *That we agree together to put* Robert Barclay's *Doctrine into Practice, in his Book called*, The Anarchy of the Ranters, *&c.* § 4. p. 32, 33. § 6. p. 48, 49. *which* (says he) *is, To declare our Faith and Persuasion in certain Fundamental Doctrines of the Christian Faith and Religion, that by the same, as well as by a good Life and Conversation, it may be known who are qualified to be Members of our Church; and that every one owned to be a Member of our Church, declare his Faith and Persuasion in every one of these Fundamentals, which is a secondary Bond of our Union, the Spirit being the Principal, which may be easily done by answering to some plain Questions with Yea or Nay.* What Reader would doubt but that this was *Robert Barclay*'s Doctrine, and that *G. K.* had taken the words before recited out of *R. B*'s Book before cited. But I assure you, Friends, upon my own diligent search, these are neither the words, nor the Doctrine of *R. B.* in that place, as any of you, that have that Book of his may see, and which I desire you to see, that ye may thereby more fully see *G. K*'s *unfair Dealing.*

His urging *lesser matters, as plain Language and Habit, refusing to salute with the Hat and Knee, and Mens and Womens Meetings, to be made and accounted by Friends Terms of their Communion, and his appealing to all intelligent Friends, whether it be not so*, shews his Ignorance and Error. I believe he will find no *intelligent* Friend, that will own any of those things to be *Terms of Communion* among us. *Fruits*, Effects and Signs, I grant they are (where they are sincerely and honestly

honeſtly performed) of that *inward* and inviſible Life of Righteouſneſs, which is indeed the true and *proper* Term and Bond of our Communion. But if every one that would ſpeak plain Language, wear plain Habit, refuſe to ſalute with Hat and Knee, and go to Mens or Womens Meetings, ſhould be thereby intitled to our Communion, we ſhould be in an ill caſe; there being many, who out of ſiniſter Ends, are forward enough to come into thoſe things, without regard to the Life of Righteouſneſs mentioned before. And of thoſe who have gone out from Friends, and wholly renounced their Communion, ſome retain ſome of theſe things, others other; and I ſuppoſe *G. K.* himſelf, and divers of them that are joined to him, may be willing for a while to retain them all, notwithſtanding their being gone into an open Separation from Friends. But although we do not make *thoſe outward* things (mentioned before) the Terms or Bond of our Communion; but that Divine Life and Power which brings them forth (where they are rightly brought forth): Yet in as much as we aſſuredly know, that the Teſtimony born in thoſe outward things (plain Language, plain Habit, and refuſing to ſalute with Hat and Knee) is *of God*, and is that which God hath led his People into, and required us to bear; and that *our Mens and Womens Meetings are of God's Inſtitution*, for the ſervice and benefit of his Church; if any would pretend to be of us, and by practice contradict our Teſtimony in the former, or *oppoſe* the latter, ſuch would thereby manifeſt to us, that they were either

either not come to, or departed from, that divine Power and Life of Righteousness, which is the Term and Bond of our holy Fellowship and Communion; and might therefore be justly refused by us, without making those outward things, the Terms of our Communion.

That Christian and gentle advice which the Yearly Meeting gave him, *to retract the bitter Language in his Books*, he Spurns disdainfully at, and flies at some that gave it; pretending also *that he can prove that Language to be due unto them to whom he hath given it.* Yet in his Plea of the Innocent, p. 11. says, *As for his giving hard Names and Words to any, it was but conditional, upon Supposition of their holding such Errors, which they did seem to favour*, &c. So liberal he has been, it seems, of his ill Language, that he stuck not to bestow his hard Names and Words, on such as displeased him, *conditionally*, and *upon Supposition* of their holding Errors, or *Seeming* to favour them. But though he like not to retract his bitter Language: Yet *the Acknowledgment* he made in the Yearly Meeting of his Passions, Weaknesses and Infirmities, he readily retracts; thereby shewing, that either he was *not sincere* and plain in his then making it, or is since *grown worse*, in endeavouring to Justify those unruly Passions, which he then Seemed Sensible of, and made a shew to condemn. He says, *For my inward Defects and Infirmities I am only accountable unto God——but to Men I am only accountable for my Words and Deeds; and as I have not acknowledged to any (nor seen just cause so to do) so they have not proved me guilty of either Words or Deeds*, that

the

the Truth condemneth in relation to those matters, whereof some have accused me. How can this hang together? That he did *Acknowledge his Passions*, &c. In the Yearly Meeting, is known to many, and not denied by himself; that he is *Accountable to Men for his Words and Deeds* he now grants; That *Railing* and *Reviling* Language, *Rude*, *Unruly* and *Turbulent* behaviour are Word and Deeds, every Man knows; and every Body that Reads his Books, may find him therein *Guilty of the one*; and every one that was present during the Yearly Meeting, must needs see him *Guilty of the other*, and that to a very high degree. Yet here he says, *He hath not acknowledged unto any (nor seen just cause so to do) himself guilty of either Words or Deeds, that the Truth condemneth in relation to these matters*, &c. What was it then, for which he did acknowledge his Passions, if it was not for either Words or Deeds, that the Truth condemneth? Is there not *Prevarication* and *Falsehood* in this? *I Judge it is more Christian* (says he) *and a greater argument of a Man's Growth towards perfection, to acknowledge his Sinful infirmities, in the Sight of God or Men, and to be Humbled under the Sense of them, than like the proud Pharisees to justifie ones self*, &c. This acknowledgment of his *Sinful infirmities*, must needs be understood of the acknowledgment he made in the Yearly Meeting; for it is here urged by himself in commendation of himself, for having made it: (and he had said in the Period just before) *As to my humane Imperfections, it is not well so to glory over me*, &c. This is an acknowledgment plain enough, that he did make such an acknowledgment, and that he reckoned

koned (as I alſo ſhould, if he had been ſincere therein) that he did well in making it. But why then doth he now *deny it again*, and ſay, *As I have not acknowledged unto any (nor ſeen juſt cauſe ſo to do) ſo they have not proved me guilty of either Words or Deeds, that the Truth condemneth in relation to theſe matters*, &c? Doth not the Truth condemn *Sinful Infirmities*? Yes ſure. And as it is truly *Chriſtian*, to acknowledge them ſincerely: So it is truly *Unchriſtian* to deny that acknowledgment again; which he would not have done, had he indeed been ſincere in making it, and rightly Humbled under the ſenſe of them: Much leſs would he have ſmitten ſecretly, and in the Dark as he has done, at others, whom he compares to *the Proud Phariſee*, and whom he charges with having *greater and more Humane weakneſſes than he, though they have neither the Sincerity nor Humility to acknowledge it*. Whereby he again implies that he had both the *Sincerity and Humility* to acknowledge his own human Imperfections or Sinful Infirmities; which if he had, he hath now ſhewn the greater *Inſincerity* and *Pride* in denying it. It was not to *Glory over him* (as he miſrepreſents it) that that acknowledgment of his in the Yearly Meeting was mention'd in the Account of the buſineſs; but to *do him right*; that ſince the *diſorder* of his Spirit, and his *unruly* Behaviour was ſo great and notorious, the Senſe he ſeemed ſome times to have, and the acknowledgment he made thereof, might be taken notice of alſo, as an Incentive to others (as well as it had been to the Meeting) to exerciſe the more Compaſſion, Charity and Patience towards him. But he ſeems

to be apprehenſive, that the mentioning thereof *May leſſen his Reputation and Chriſtian Teſtimony among Friends.* So that as loudly as he exclaims (without cauſe that appears) againſt others, for *covering and cloaking* groſs and vile Errors, he would have been willing, I perceive, to have had his own *diſorderly* Paſſions, and *turbulent* Behaviour *covered and cloaked*, for his own Reputation ſake, and Chriſtian Teſtimony (as he calls it) among Friends. But as well may *a Fountain ſend forth at the ſame place ſweet Water and bitter, ſalt and freſh* (which the Apoſtle *James* denies it can, *Jam.* 3. 11, 12.) as a *Chriſtian Teſtimony* proceed from that Spirit, which led him into thoſe *unruly Paſſions*, beyond what I have lightly ſeen in Men of the loweſt pretences to Religion. And if (as the ſame Appoſtle ſays, *chap.* 1. *ver.* 26.) *that Man's Religion is vain, who ſeeming to be Religious, bridleth not his Tongue, but deceiveth his own Heart:* ſurely vain it is to expect a Chriſtian Teſtimony from ſuch an one.

It is ſtrange that *G. K.* complaining ſo oft, as he doth in his Books, of his having been *condemned in* America *without all hearing, Conviction, or Tryal* (though that is both denied and diſapproved by the Friends there) ſhould alſo complain of the Yearly Meeting, for not condemning the Friends there, *Without all hearing, Conviction*, or *Tryal*, which it muſt have done, had it condemned them there, who are abſent, and diſtant ſeveral thouſand Miles. But it is more ſtrange, that after he hath *broken from the Unity*, and gone out into an *open Separation* from Friends, he ſhould have the hardneſs, to ſay in his Poſt-

ſcript

ſcript, *I declare my Real and Sincere intention, t remain in Unity with all faithful Friends and Brethren every where.* His declared intention to *continue to meet with Friends*, is that, my Friends which I doubt not ye will be ſo far from denying to him, that ye will deſire he may ſo meet with you, that he may come to be *Bowed* and truly Hum bled before the Lord, and made effectually ſenſible of, ſorry and truly penitent for, his out-going from Truth, and the Unity of Friends, both in Spirit and Practice: Which if he come not to, but continue to meet with you in the ſame Spirit and Mind, in which he went out from Friends, and made the *Breach* and *Separation* elſewhere, his Meeting with you will be but a *Burden* to you, and an *aggravation* of *Condemnation* to himſelf. But his *continuing to exerciſe his Gift of Miniſtry* (as he expreſſes it) *amongſt you*, while he continues in that *evil Mind*, and Spirit of Contention, Diviſion and Diſcord, wherein he hath of late appear'd, muſt needs be *a very great Exerciſe* and Burden to you, till the Lord ſhall be pleaſed to eaſe you of it.

He ſays, *It hath not been his way, to uſe any interruption or diſturbance towards any, but to behave himſelf orderly and peaceably towards all.* This is *ſmoothly*, but *falſly* ſaid, and by this may his Truth and *Sincerity* be judged of. For at the very firſt publick Meeting he appeared in at *London*, after his *laſt* arrival in *England*, he gave ſuch *Interruption*, and made ſo great *Diſturbance*, as the like hath ſcarce been ever known in any Meeting in that City. This many that were at thoſe Meetings are witneſſes of: Yet hath he the con-

confidence now to say, *It hath not been my way to use any Interruption or Disturbance towards any, but to behave my self orderly and peaceably towards all.* Which single Passage is of it self enough to render his whole Books *Nauseous*, to as many as have the knowledge of the disturbance he made at those Meetings. Besides what he hath done at other Meetings since:

Again he says, *I would have none to entertain Jealousies and evil thought concerning me, as if I did design any Breach among faithful Friends*; when as he has already made a great and open Breach in *America*, and is with his Copartners, Labouring and Endeavouring to make the like here; and that with such (I hope, groundless) hopes of Success that some of them have adventured to represent the Yearly Meeting as divided, and call the Judgment given therein, *the Judgment of a Party, or Faction of that Meeting.* And *G. K.* himself, in his late Book, called *The Causless Ground of Jealousies*, &c. *removed*, p. 6. having recited part of that Sentence in the Yearly Meeting's Paper of advice to him, *viz. It is the clear and general Sence of this Meeting, that G. Keith and the Rest concerned therein with him, were not Acted in God's Wisdom and Counsel therein*, &c. Says, *But we do well know it is not the general Sence of Friends to blame us.* This shews he not only Laboured to make, but thought also he had made some *Breach* among Friends concerning him, and had drawn some to be of a *contrary Sence*, to the clear and general Sence of the Yearly Meeting in that matter, and yet at the same time says, *I*

would have none to entertain jealousies & evil thoughts concerning me, as if I did design any Breach among faithful Friends. What he adds of his *Thirty Years Labour in the Work of the Ministry, and his great success therein, in being an Instrument to the bringing* Many *into the Blessed Unity,* savours of a *boasting* Spirit, and had been more comely from anothers Pen, than from his own: I would by no means detract from, or depretiate his former Labours: Yet I cannot but express my fear, that he hath been Instrumental to draw many more from the Blessed Unity and Fellowship of the Gospel, than ever he brought into it: For which the Doom was long since set, *Ezek.* 18. 24. But that he may *proceed no further* therein, nor any more be beguiled by him, is my Earnest Desire, and the End of this my Undertaking. For I felt a Concern upon my Spirit, in the universal Love of God, to salute the whole Flock of God by way of Epistle, and therein to lay open something of the Nature, Work, and mischievous Design of that Spirit, which now works in these Instruments of Discord and Division; and to warn all Friends to beware thereof.

Wherefore, dear Friends, every where, *be ye warned, be ye warned*; and being warned, be ye *armed* against the Assaults and Allurements of the Enemy, into whatsoever Appearance he *transform* himself, and by whatsoever Instruments he works: For he is a *Subtil* Adversary, a *Cunning* Hunter, an *Adulterated* Spirit, that hunts for the precious Life to destroy it. But, Friends, *ye have an Unction from the Holy One;*

and

and as the Anointing, which ye have received of him, abideth in you, abide ye in it, and keep close unto it, so shall ye not need that any Man teach you; but the same Anointing which is Truth, and no Lie, will teach you, will lead you, will direct, guide, keep, and preserve you out of the power and reach of the Destroyer, and will give you a *savour in your selves*, and a *Discerning* of this Spirit, and its work of Division and Separation *not to be of God*; but to be the old rending Spirit, that would *lay waste* the Heritage of God, and *scatter* what God has gathered. Which having been discovered and laid open in its former appearances, hath now put on a *new Dress*, and taken up a *new Pretence*, different from the former, and works in and by *new Instruments*, that it may the more easily deceive. But the Light discovers it, and its Instruments, to be *Enemies to God*, and their works manifest them to be out of the holy peaceable Truth, who are in the *Heats*, *Passions*, *Rage* and *Fury* one while, and by and by *Soothing*, *Fawning*, *Flattering*. Therefore, Friends, dwell in the Light, which makes all things manifest; and keep your Habitation therein, and your Eye *single*; so shall ye see plainly the way of the working of this *Carping*, *Cavilling*, *Treacherous* Spirit, which hath *laid Trains* to ensnare and betray the simple, putting *Captious* Questions, in *dark* and *ambiguous* Terms, on purpose to get advantage on the Answerers; who though honest, sincere and conscientious to God, yet through unskilfulness in such Questions and

Terms, might haply drop ſome *weak* Expreſſion, which the Adverſary forthwith *catching*, and perverſly *ſtraining* to the *worſt* Conſtruction, publiſhed to the World, thereby expoſing not the particular Perſons only, but even our holy Profeſſion, and the bleſſed Truth it ſelf which we profeſs, to the ſcorn, deriſion and contempt of the World. Ah Friends, can ſuch work be of God? Ye know *it cannot*. The Light hath diſcovered whence it aroſe, how it hath been wrought, and for what end; and the Lord is greatly offended with it, and with all that have an hand therein; and ſore, and heavy will his Judgment be, in the great Day of Accompt, upon all that ſhall be found joined to this Treacherous Spirit. Therefore, Friends, in the tender Love of God, I beſeech and warn you all *ſtand clear of it, join not to it, touch not with it*, nor give any countenance or incouragement to it, or to any that are Agents for it, or Inſtruments in its Work. But ſtand up in the Teſtimony of God againſt it, and travel in Spirit with the Lord for the recovery of thoſe *ſimple ones* out of its ſnare, who through the *ſubtilty* of its working, and the *cunning Craftineſs* of ſome of its Inſtruments, have been beguiled and drawn there into. And this know for certain, Friends, that *the way to recover the deceived, is to diſcover, lay open and witneſs againſt the Deceivers*. The God of Peace be with you all, direct, guide and keep you all in his peaceable Wiſdom, and fill you more and more with his heavenly Power, that therein ye may ſtand up faithful Witneſſes for him

him, and be instrumentally Saviours unto others. This is the sincere Desire, and earnest Breathing of

Your Friend and Brother, in the Fellowship of the Gospel of Christ Jesus our Lord,

The 25th. of the 4th. Month 1694.

T. E.

POST-

POSTSCRIPT.

TWO things I take notice of, in the Pamphlet Subscribed by *R. Hannay*, which I thought not so proper to be medled with before, because I would not interweave them with the foregoing Discourse. One is, that in the Introduction to the Queries, p. 9. the Yearly Meeting at *London* is blamed because the several Members thereof did not set their Hands to their Paper of Advice and Judgment given to *G. K.* but ordered the Clerk of the Meeting to Sign it on the Meeting's behalf. This is there urged as *a just cause of Suspicion, that they were not acted by the Counsel of God.* But in this the *Caviller* is both *weak* and *unjust*. *Weak*, in not considering that in great Assemblies, whether Civil or Religious, it is both usual and convenient that the Acts of the Assembly be signed by the Clerk belonging to it, or by some one Member, in the Name of the whole. *Unjust*, in blaming the Friends of the Yearly Meeting for that, which (it seems) was the Practice of their own Adjourned Monthly Meeting (as they call it) at *Philadelphia*, where three several Judgments, given in three several Cases, were Signed, by Order of that Meeting, by *J. W.* (whether their Hired Clerk, or a Member of that Meeting, is not material)

as

as *G. K.* hath ſet them forth in his Book called, *Some Reaſons*, &c. *of the late Separation*, p. 11.

The other thing that I take notice of is, *Their oppoſing the Judgment of a Yearly Meeting* (as they call it) *at* Burlington, *to that of the Yearly Meeting at* London; whereas upon inquiry I find that that Meeting at *Burlington*, from which that Judgment was given in favour of *G. Keith*, was a *ſeparate Meeting*, made up moſtly of ſuch as uſed to go to their ſeparate Meetings in thoſe parts, (and ſome others, who ſeldom or never went to Friends Meetings at all) in oppoſition to the Yearly Meeting of Friends, holden in the ſame Town, at the ſame time. And how properly it is called a Yearly Meeting, that never was before, nor perhaps may ever be hereafter, deſerves to be conſidered.

The END.

ERRATA.

Page 13, line 12. read *contained*: p. 15. l. 21. r. *many Pages*: p. 16. l. 4. r. *Mouths*: l. 19. r. *paſſed*: p. 17. l. 9. after Meetings, *dele* the Comma: l. 12. after Papiſts, *dele* the Comma: p. 23. l. laſt, f. *we*, r. *he*: p. 25. l. 28. f. *at*, r. *as*: p. 39. l. 7. r. *Scriptures*: l. 14 and 15. r. *Diſcipline*: p. 45. l. 26. f. *thither*, r. *hither*: p. 46. l. 2. f. *hath*, r. *have*: p. 49. l. 2. r. *Quakers*: p. 56. l. 7. f. *from* r. *for*.

THE END.

ERRATA.

281675